



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



HX1
I61
v.6.

Library of



Princeton University.



The International Socialist Review

A MONTHLY JOURNAL
OF INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALIST THOUGHT

VOLUME VI

JULY, 1905—JUNE, 1906



CHICAGO
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
1906

(RECAP)

Hx 1

.161

v.6

1905-06

CONTENTS

ATKINSON, WARREN— Why We Don't Win	614	HOLST, HENRIETTA ROLAND— Gorky as a Literary Critic.....	705
PERGLER, CHARLES— A Word of Protest.....	486	HYNDMAN, H. M.— State Socialism and Social Democracy	87
PERGLER, CHARLES— An Example of Strength.....	610	Stagnation and Movement in Great Britain	577
ANDERSON, ANDREW WM.— Australian Labor Convention.....	141	KAUTSKY, KARL— Revolutions, Past and Present.....	385
ANONYMOUS— Why I am Content in Journalism..	78	KLEIN, NICHOLAS— The situation in Hungary.....	400
BAKER, J. E., HIGDAY, H. M., MOWRY, D. E.— Socialist and Socialism.....	45	LADOFF, ISADOR— Why Socialism is a Power in Russia	395
BEBEL, AUGUST— Socialism and the General Strike in Germany	257	LAFARGUE, PAUL— The Rights of the Horse and the Rights of Man	145
BERGEN, H.— Socialism and Philosophy.....	204	LAPIS— The Railroad Situation in the United States	649
BOUDIN, L. B.— Marx and His Critics.....	8, 101, 165	LEWIS, AUSTIN— Engels Thirty Years Afterwards....	676
Surplus Value and Its Division.....	220	LEONARD, O.— Revolutionary Russia	1
The Labor Theory of Value in the Light of Recent Criticism.....	302, 350	MANN, TOM— Political Position of the Labor and Socialist Party in Australia.....	137
The Marxian Theory of Value and Surplus Value	414	MARCY, MARY E. A.— Felicitan Fair	729
The Great Contradiction in the Marxian Theory of Value.....	465	MILLS H. WORD— The Political Side of Economics....	41
Economic Contradictions and the Passing of Capitalism	524	O'HARE, KATE RICHARDS— The Land of Graft.....	598
The Concentration of Capital and the Disappearance of the Middle Class	715	PARMALEE, MAURICE F.— Public Defense in Criminal Trials...	228
BREHOLTZ, EDWIN ARNOLD— Concerning Sacrifices	164	PATTERSON, JOSEPH M.— Resignation of	553
CHASE, CHARLES H.— Materialism and Socialism	404, 457	POR, ODON— The Glorification of Work.....	35
Materialism in its Relation to Socialism and Progress	547	QUELCH, H.— The Unemployed Agitation in England	390
CROSBY, ERNEST— Garrison, and the Materialistic Interpretation of History	513	ROBERTS, WALLIS— A Socialist Casuistry	489
The Materialistic Interpretation of History	725	RUSSIAN REVOLUTION— A Hero of the	412
DEBS, E. V.— The Industrial Convention.....	85	SEABURY, EMMA PLAYTER— The Idlers (Poem).....	675
ETHERTON, E. E.— Why Revivals No Longer Revive....	686	SIMONS, A. M.— Industrial Workers of the World..	65, 172
GIBSON, GEORGE H.— The American Marseillaise (Poem)..	33	Recent Tendencies in German Social Democracy	193
HALL, COVINGTON— My Mammy's Son (Poem).....	144	Poets of the Social Revolution.....	347
HERRON, GEORGE D.— A Statement and Denial.....	217	Science vs. Mysticism	517
HISON, U. O.— Revolutionary Anthem (Poem).....	455	King Kerosene and the Labor Movement	583
HITCH, MARCUS— The Gist of Marxism.....	202	The Western Federation of Miners..	642

CONTENTS.

III

Packington, The Jungle and its Critics	712
SOMBART, WERNER—	
Study of the Historical Development of the American Proletariat 129, 293, 358	
"THE NEW INTERNATIONAL"....	689
THOMPSON, CARL D.—	
Wisconsin and Her Critics.....	20
TODD, DUNDAS—	
Does God Kno What a Thief is?.....	111
A Unique Game	723

TURNER, F. JACKSON, PH. D.—	
The Significance of the Frontier in American History	321
UNTERMANN, ERNEST—	
Evolution of the Theory of Evolution	26, 90, 163
Marxism and Electionism	589
A Pioneer of Proletarian Science....	605
WESTLING, HJALMAR—	
A Peculiar Scientist.....	541
WYNKOP, DAVID J.—	
General Election in Holland	149

DEPARTMENTS

THE WORLD OF LABOR—	
Max S. Hayes	54, 117, 180, 240, 312, 373, 434, 500, 566, 628
EDITORIALS—	
A. M. Simons.	
The Wisconsin Situation	51
Work That Should Be Done.....	114
Science and the Workers	176
Government by Mimeograph	236
Conditions in Germany and America.	307
The Pittsburg Convention of the A. F. of L.	368
Probable Outlook for Russia.....	430
Socialism und Government Ownership	494
Conspiracy to Murder	558
An Exhibition of Solidarity.....	623
The General Strike.....	752
SOCIALISM ABROAD—	
Argentina	123
Australia	371
Austria	370, 432, 625
Belgium	59, 626
Denmark	562
England	497, 564, 626
France	59, 244, 499, 562, 626
Germany	58, 121, 179, 248, 432, 564
Holland	122
Hungary	245, 310, 563
Italy	179, 563
Japan	247
Mexico	498
Norway	59, 245, 310, 433
Russia.....	122, 310, 372, 498, 625, 626
Spain	179, 499
Sweden	244, 310
Switzerland	432, 499, 563
Tasmania	756

BOOK REVIEWS—	
A. M. Simons.	
A Great Iniquity; Leo Tolstoy's....	442
A Knight of the Toilers; Arthur Newell	570
Amerika und die Handelsvertragspolitik; Max Schippel	377
Better-World Philosophy, A Sociological Synthesis; J. H. Moore.....	505
Bible, Beer and Socialism; S. J. Brownson, M. D.	572
Changing Order, The, A Study of Democracy; Oscar Lovell Triggs..	504

Colonial Administration; Paul S. Reinsch	633
Concentration of Wealth; Henry Laurens	766
Curse of Race Prejudice; Jas. F. Morton Jr.	766
Death and the Socialist Ideal; H. M. Hyndman's	508
Elements of Sociology; Frank W. Blackmar	634
End Inevitable; C. E. Obenchain..	767
End of the World, The; Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer	506
Essays on Socialism; E. J. Foote... 442	
Fallacies of Socialism, Rev. Chas. W. Tinsley.....	766
Forces that Make for Socialism in America; John Spargo	250
From Star-Dust to Socialism; Rev. A. M. Stirtton.....	766
Foundations of Sociology, The; Edward A. Ross	316
Freeman or Slave; Fred D. Warren	125
Frenzied Finance; The Crime of Amalgamated; Thomas W. Lawson	571
Game, The; Jack London	184
Germes of Mind in Plants; R. H. France	376
Grain Trust Exposed, The; Tom Worrall	572
Greatest Trust in the World, The; Charles Edward Russell.....	505
How to Know the Starry Heavens; Edward Irving	125
Industrial History of the United States; Katharine Coman	440
L'Avenir du Socialisme; Paul Louis.	60
Lewis-Harriman Debate	767
Long Day, The; The Story of a New York Working Girl as Told by Herself	440
Massenstreik und Ethik; Dr. Rannence of Privilege, The; Henry George, Jr.	506
My Little Book of Prayer; Muriel Strofe	185
Napoleon Myth, The; Henry Ridgeley Evans	317
New Chivalry, The; Bertha S. Wilkins	636
New Creations in Plant Life; W. S. Harwood	507
Paris and the Social Revolution; Alvan Francis Sanborn	249
Plais du Caucase; E. Akouni.....	766

525683

Science and Revolution; Ernest Untermann	437	Songs of Socialism; Harvey P. Moyer	185
Socialism and Christianity; Rt. Rev. Wm. Stang, D. D., Bishop of Fall River	250	Text Book of Sociology; James Q. Bealey and Lester F. Ward.....	316
Socialism and Society; J. Ramsay MacDonald	439	Thoughts of a Fool; Evelyn Gladys.	377
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific; Frederick Engels	508	Trade Unionism and Labor Prob- lems; John R. Commons	570
Socialist Songs, Dialogues and Reci- tations; Josephine R. Cole.....	441	Triumph of Life, The; Wilhelm Boelsche	634
Socialists, Who they are, and What they Stand for; John Spargo.....	765	Trusts; W. A. Orme	442
Songs of Russia; Alice Stone Black- well	767	Underfed School Children, The Prob- lem and the Remedy; John Spargo	636
Soixante-Quinze Annes De Domina- tion, Essays; Camille Huysmans, Louis De Brouckere, and Louis Bertrand	185	War of the Classes; Jack London...	184
		What of the Future; H. J. Darius..	571
		Why the Church Opposes Socialism; Fred D. Warren	572
		Women in the Printing Trades; J. Ramsay McDonald	125
		World's Revolutions, The; Ernest Untermann	635

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

JULY, 1905

NO. I

Revolutionary Russia.

"Only the shallow minded see subtle catastrophies and inexplicable happenings in nature as in history," says Barbe Gendre. We hear of an uprising and think it is sudden. The cry for freedom, for rights of man reaches our ear, from a distant land, and we think that the people of that land have suddenly awakened from a deep slumber. But these are erroneous ideas. Nothing in nature or in history is sudden, though it may seem so. Every change, every resolution is the result of slow steady growth.

When we first heard of the great strikes in dark despotic Russia we were somewhat puzzled. Had the goddess of discontent and revolt turned her eyes toward the land of the knout? Had Liberty showed her enticing beauty to the poor oppressed people of an unfortunate land?

We might well ask ourselves these questions. For we pay very little attention to Russia's inner life, when things go on in their "normal" course. But whether we know it or not, these strikes of today, those for liberty as well as those for bread, are the natural result of years of hard work on the part of liberty loving men and women.

To go back to the history of the revolutionary movement, we might begin with the year 1825, when the first attempt to overthrow tyranny was made. This attempt was made on December 26 (14 old style) of that year, by those who were afterwards called the "Decembrists," a group composed mostly of members of the aristocracy who during their stay in Paris became imbued with the spirit of liberty. This attempt was crushed by the crude Nicholas I.

Before going further let me say that Russia was not always a despotic monarchy. It had communal autonomy, and local liberties. About the 13th and 14th centuries Russia had developed industrial centers that could be likened to little republics. But

they all perished in the flames caused by Ivan III and Ivan IV (XVI century) and with the death of these centers freedom passed.

Liberty can never die, it may endure a lethargic sleep, but die never. Tyrants may think that it can be killed, but time and history have proved the reverse. When the "Decembrist" movement was destroyed, the crowned despot congratulated himself, he believed that the friends of freedom were dead forever. Before long however, we see Alex. Herzen appear on the stage. Herzen was a man of learning and great literary talent. His noble ideas expressed in a beautiful literary style won a place for him in the hearts of the younger generation, and for the cause of freedom they won noble soldiers. "Kolokol" (the Bell), a paper he published, was eagerly read by all intelligent classes. As for its influence we need only listen to the sublime apostle Peter Krapotkin, who says, "The beauty of the style of Herzen—of whom Turgenieff has truly said that he wrote in tears and in blood as no other Russian,—the breadth of his ideas and his deep love for Russia took possession of me, and I used to read and reread those pages even with more full of heart than brain" (Autobiography of a Revolutionist). Scores of young men and women would unhesitatingly say the same thing of Herzen. Such was his influence, and this influence bore fruit.

High ideals and noble inspirations took possession of the youth. An irresistible desire to lift the people "to pay the peasant his debt" overtook them. When Alexander II who was advised by his teacher, the loving poet Jukovsky, to remain a man on the throne, began to reign over Russia, every heart was directed toward him in the hope that he might prove a helper in this cause.

When, in 1861 the proclamation of liberation of the serfs was published, it seemed this hope would be realized. Twenty thousand serfs were made free! how much help, moral and material, was needed! The youths set to work, they opened night schools to instruct the peasant whose children they taught during the day. The press being practically free, it gave birth to great writers. To that period we owe Tchernishevsky Dobruliuboff and Lavroff. The latter's "Historical Letters," published in the "Sovovremnic" (Contemporary) were the basis of the future Nihilist movement.

However Alexander II was not a man of strength. He was soon persuaded by conservative despots, that his policy would undermine him; that the growing spirit would end in revolution and in the destruction of the empire. The monarch forgot his teacher's advice, he shut down the schools at once, imprisoned the teachers, persecuted the writers and censored the press. This reaction of the emperor created a contra reaction. An underground movement came into existence. Those who had tried to help the czar in his attempt to reform became its leaders.

The workers of this movement were the best and noblest men and women Russia had. Besides writers, poets and philosophers, we find men who have had public offices; Osinsky was secretary of a City Hall; Voinaralsky a justice of the peace; Sucharoff a young marine officer of noble birth. These and scores of others resigned their positions and went to work for freedom's cause.

Freedom and speech of the press being forbidden, other means of protest against tyranny were looked for. Nechaieff tried to organize a secret society for the preparation of a popular uprising. The attempt failed; some victims fell.

Meanwhile armies of young men and women went to Zurich to study. There amidst freedom's lovers these young students became enamoured of liberty. Alexander II, who had changed his policy in the meantime, fearing that these men and women might become dangerous if they continued to remain in Switzerland, published an "Ukaz" (1873) ordering all the students to return immediately. A refusal to obey this command meant everlasting banishment.

Hundreds of students all imbued with the words of Bakunin and with the ideas of Marx and Lavroff hastened home. We now enter the period when the cry "among the people" came from every noble heart.

These young men who on their return to Russia found a country where the word liberty became a dangerous word, threw off their broadcloth and put on the coarse garb of the peasant and the laborer. The pen was exchanged for the hoe, the library and laboratory, for the shop and factory. Side by side with the worker and peasant they could talk to him of the ideas of freedom and justice; they could help him and console him.

Spies were sent broadcast by the government and they dragged men to prison for the crime of reading a Socialist book or newspaper. Thus the breach between the government and the lovers of the people became more and more pronounced.

It must be remembered that the Russian woman has done her share of work well. The names of women like Sophia Perovskaya, Sophia Bardine, Sophia von Herzfeld, Jessie Helfman, Figner and numbers of others can never be forgotten. All these women, most of whom belonged to the highest aristocracy, left luxurious homes to live in huts with the peasant. Sophia Bardine, who was reared in luxury, worked fifteen hours a day as a weaver and slept on straw, only to be with her sister workers in order to present to them the dawn of a better day to come. Sophia von Herzfeld was sent to Siberia after she was made to witness her dear husband's death on the gallows. Before such heroes and heroines even their foes might raise the hat in awe.

Those enumerated here are only a few of the many victims

of Russian despotism. Persecutions, prisons, torture, Siberia and gallows could not kill the revolutionary movement. The propaganda went on actively, and in the year 1877 we see a new era setting in. This era is marked by the two greatest political trials in Russia—the trial of the fifty and that of the one hundred ninety three.

The trial of the fifty was especially remarkable for the great number of women who were among the delinquents. These women, part of them students who had just returned from abroad, were as courageous as their male comrades. Sophia Bardine for instance, delivered a long address in court. She gave a resume of the ideas that she and her comrades propagated, and finished with the following words:

“The group of which I am a member, is a group of peaceful propagandists. To help the people see the ideal of a better social order, an order based on justice, or rather to awaken the dim ideal that slumbers in the brain of the people, to point out the faults of the present state of society and by this avoid falling into the same errors in the future, this is our ideal. When the good hour of this beautiful time will strike, we know not, it does not depend on us.

“Whatever may be my fate, I do not ask any mercy from you. Strike us as hard as you please. I am convinced that all your drastic measures to hinder our work will not be able to kill a movement that is caused by the spirit of the time. To be sure, you can hinder its growth for a moment, but it will grow stronger. The day will come I am certain, when society will awaken from its lethargic sleep, and it will blush with shame because it had allowed its brothers, sisters, children, in fine that it had allowed the sacrifice of these people whose only crime was that they spoke out frankly their convictions. All our suffering will then be avenged. Strike ye judges; you have the brute force, we have the moral rights, the law of historic progress, the irresistible power of the ideal, but know ye, that this power cannot be conquered by bayonets.”

We can imagine what an impression these words, coming from a young woman, made on the jury and the public. After her came Alexeeff, a man of the people, he spoke about the ills of the present system and concluded with these words: “Yes, only these generous youths have given us their helping hand. They will guide us till the day will come when we shall be able to understand our rights we shall then be able ourselves to work for the emancipation of the world, till the day comes when the strong arm of millions of workers will be lifted...”

The judge (angry) “Enough I command.”

Alexeeff (raising his voice) “and in spite of all your bayonets, that protect despotism, they will put an end to it.”

These addresses, the frankness with which they were spoken, the sincerity of the speakers, gained great sympathy for them and their cause. The sentences were comparatively light.

Soon after this, the great trial of the one hundred ninety three took place. In this were involved Kibalchitch, Perovskaya, Mychkine, Helfman, Rissakoff Jeliaboff. These too, availed themselves of the opportunity to bring their ideas before the public. For this the court room was as good as any other place. Some protested against the exclusion of the representatives of the press from the court room, and against the closing of the door to the general public. Mychkine said: "This is no trial, it is a ridiculous farce. Tools of a despot, cringing cowards, to obtain a high rank, a decoration, trifle with other people's lives, jesting at truth and justice, at all that is sacred on earth."

This was too much for the tools of czarism. The cossacks at once fell to beating the speaker and other defendants. But this time too the sentences were not very heavy, on the whole. Not long after these trials the public was aroused by a pistol shot, which may be said to announce the era of terrorism. A young girl, Vera Sasulitch by name, asked for an audience with General Trepoff and as soon as she found herself face to face with Russia's Torquemada, she shot at him. The public was perplexed, every one gave another interpretation to her act. But great was the astonishment when the real cause was learned. This pistol shot was a protest against the recent torture of Boguliupoff—an imprisoned student whom she had never seen. So great was the public sympathy for this self-sacrificing maiden, that she was acquitted.

The act of Vera Sasulitch should have served as a warning. But despotism was too stupid to understand it. Not only did its brutality not cease, but it became fiercer. Revolutionists were tortured and killed. This of course was answered by similiar deeds against the government officials.

The men and women who began to propagate peacefully the ideal of liberty and justice, saw that naught but violence was left. In violence some of them saw the only way toward salvation. Others still desired to continue the propaganda peacefully, a breach became inevitable and two parties were formed, "Zemlia i Volia" (Land and Freedom) and "Narodnia Volia" (the Will of the People). The will of the People party was that of the terrorists, with Mikailoff and Tokomirow as organizers, and Lavroff as editor of their organ called "The Messenger of the Will of the People." Mikailoff knew every corner of St. Petersburg; he was the most daring character in the movement and no one was as much on the alert as he. He was a member of the executive committee that sentenced Alexander II to death on August 26,

1879, after first giving him due warning, to alter his conduct. We know that after a few unsuccessful attempts this sentence was carried out on March 1, 1881.

The revolutionary movement had to pay dearly for the life of the monarch. Sophia Perovskaya, Geliaboff, Kviatcovsky, Kibaltchich and Hesse Helfman were among those who were to suffer imprisonment and death. Although the movement suffered by this enormous loss, the remaining force did not lose courage. On the accession of the new czar, Alexander III, the executive committee sent him the following note:

"If the supreme power ceases to be arbitrary: if it honestly resolves to be the organ of the nation's will, your majesty may then without fear dismiss the spies that dishonor the government, send back the soldiers to the barracks and burn the gallows. The Executive Committee will of itself renounce its role, and the forces grouped around it will scatter to work for the welfare of the people and the furtherance of civilization. A peaceful propaganda will take the place of the violent strife—a strife that displeases us more than it displeases your servants, but to which the conditions only impell us. We hope that the desire for revenge will not overpower in you, Sire, the voice of duty, the desire to listen to truth. Desire of revenge! Have we not also the right to feel it? You have lost a father, we have lost not only parents, we have lost brothers, wives, children, our dearest friends. But despite all this, if Russia's salvation demands it, we are ready to lay aside every personal passion. That much we expect from your Highness."

The reader has learned by this time, I hope, the character of the Russian revolutionary movement and that of its promoters.

What difference is there between the movement of which we have spoken and the movement of today? The difference is great and significant. But few years ago only students and members of the aristocratic families were engaged in the fight for freedom. Few workers or men of the people could be found in the ranks of the revolutionists. Today thousands of them have joined the movement. The revolutionary movement is no longer a movement of the "higher classes." It is a movement of workers, class conscious workers, well organized, ready to carry on a propaganda work that in some respects is more complete than the propaganda work for advanced ideas in free America. Books and pamphlets are scattered broadcast, newspapers and magazines are handed to the workers. Besides the literature printed in Russia, some is imported from England, America and Switzerland. The latter being the center of activity, whence funds and literature go to Russia. As a means of active propaganda the strike is employed. The strike is the best teacher of solidarity. Violence is not as

wide spread as formerly, violence is only resorted to in extreme cases. Of course the work is carried on with some difficulty, especially as the numbers are swelling. Discretion must be used, spies must be kept out.

The meetings are generally in private houses, sometimes important meetings are held on the water. One or more circles of workers, people whose good faith is above doubt, rent row boats, on Sunday, and set out for a pleasure ride. When they are far enough on the river, away from inquisitive eyes the boats get nearer each other and a regular conference begins. Ways and means, as to how to carry on the propaganda work is discussed. Reports of committees are rendered, news from abroad are read and the meeting closes with songs of liberty coming from hopeful maidens and valiant youths. Where such meetings are impracticable the deep forest is resorted to.

As to how much the outside people sympathize with the movement may be illustrated by the following story, told me by a friend of mine, who was prominent in the movement: "A lot of young fellows all students, were assembled in my room, I lived in the house of a very pious Jew, we were discussing the situation of our fatherland and of the people. When we disbanded it was two o'clock in the morning. When I conducted my friends to the door, I was surprised to find my host awake. This being very unusual at such an advanced hour, I asked him, 'Why have you not gone to bed Reb Moishe?' He smiled, nodded his head and answered in a whisper, 'You think I do not know what you young men are discussing. I know it very well. May the Lord crown your efforts with victory. I am awake to watch over you my children, as you lay your young lives at stake for us.'"

O. LEONARD.

Leclaire College, Edwardsville, Ill.

Marx and His Critics.

(Continued.)

THE first objection to be considered here is the so-called "philosophic" objection. We will consider it first because of its great pretensions and because of its old age, it being in reality merely a new edition of the old idealistic philosophy with which Marx had to deal as far back as 1845. In its pure idealistic form Marx squared his accounts with it in his own masterly fashion in his book "*Die Heilige Familie*." The account was settled, the balance was struck, and no more was heard of idealism. It now re-appears bashfully under cover of a scientific theory of cognition and psychology. No matter what its garb, however, it is essentially the same, except that with the loss of its purity it has lost its logic. Pure idealism, as represented by Hegel for instance, is logically a perfectly constructed edifice. It rests on false foundations. But its premises admitted, its logical construction is impregnable. Not so with modern "philosophy." It is idealistic without the logic of the finished idealistic structure. What is worse, however, it is reactionary, which is not necessarily an attribute of idealism. Desiring to avoid the logical consequences of the development of philosophy, in which the idealistic system of Hegel must inevitably be followed by the Materialism of Marx, its watchword is: "Go back." And the further back the better.... So that we find Weisengruen, a leading light among those philosophers, throwing loving glances at Berkeley, who was perhaps as much of an idealist as Hegel himself but who was utterly devoid of the historic sense which made Hegel a truly great philosopher and his system a great step forward in the development of philosophy.

Indeed their aversion towards anything that has some historic sense leads Weisengruen, otherwise a sane and bright thinker, to declare that the real force that makes History is the imagination or phantasy (*Phantasie*). To use his own words: "Phantasy is the demi-urge of all History.... Not the developed intellect, but the elementary phantasy." A discovery which is worthy to rank with that of the charlatan Nossig, who, after posing as a great scientific Marx-critic, gravely announced, with all the pomp of pseudo-science, that he discovered a remedy to all our social evils in the old Jewish custom of the Jubilee.

We cannot, however, go here into the details of the philosophic objection and its numerous variants. Such discussions are only intended by their authors for German professors and such

others as enjoy the perusal of bulky volumes. Under no circumstances are they meant for magazine readers. I will simply say, therefore, that the sum and substance of all these arguments amounts to this: That there is no way in which material conditions can be shown, philosophically, to turn into ideas; consequently, that ideas cannot be the result of economic conditions; and that, therefore, the existence of ideas and their influence on History not being denied, economic conditions cannot be the prime movers of History.

The answer to all of which is, again without going into long and abstruse philosophic discussions, that, as Engels puts it, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. That if we can prove by historic *data* that the development of ideas *did* follow the development of economic conditions then we need not worry over the "philosophic" question of how the transformation was accomplished. That it will then be the business of "philosophy" to take care of itself and show how it was done or frankly confess its impotency. It is clearly a case of those philosophers' own funeral.

It is true that the learned philosophers, in the person of Professor Masaryk strongly object to the introduction of such vulgar "matters" as puddings into the discussion of such lofty subjects. But the loftiness is all theirs, and we who do not soar in the realms of phantasy can very well afford to stick to the gross "material" facts. We, therefore, claim, with Engels, that the proof of the materialistic conception of history must be furnished by history itself.

But when it comes to actual history, they must admit that the facts, or at least a good many of them, happen to tally with the unphilosophic Materialistic conception of History. So says Weisengruen himself:

"For certain historical relations within certain periods of time this historical theory (The Materialistic Conception of History) is a relatively correct, practical, explanatory principle (*Erklärungsprincip*). We can, for instance, by its aid drag out from historical obscurity the more hidden economic forces which propelled the French Revolution. We can, by its aid, I am convinced throw more clear and glaring light on the period of decline of the Roman Empire, than could be done until now. Many phases of the German (?) middle ages may be understood by us with the aid of a mild economic motivation. The powerlessness of the German Bourgeoisie, particularly during the year 1848, may be partly explained by purely economic causes."

As the reader will see, this great opponent of Marxism, who in another place of his book insists that Marxism must be thrown overboard, bag and baggage, is willing to concede quite considerable to the Materialistic Conception of History. In fact, he has

nonchalantly conceded almost all of European History since the beginning of the Christian Era (The breaking up of the Roman Empire, the German Middle ages, the French Revolution, the German Revolution), with the exception of the Renaissance which he specifically exempts from the influences of material conditions and reserves it, supposedly, for "higher" influences. He then draws the general conclusion that some relations ("*zusammenhänge*") and periods may be treated according to the Materialistic Conception of History, and others may not. Curious as it may seem for a philosopher to arrive at such half-way conclusion about a purely philosophic matter, it is even more curious to observe that this same philosopher and critic, instead of following up his conclusion by an examination of the provinces and periods when the Materialistic Conception of History does apply and when it does not, at least in general terms, turns around and declares that as far as we can see, there are no historical laws at all, and that it is practically impossible to write or treat history scientifically, in short, that there is no historical science. This Nihilism, which as we have said, is the last recourse of the opponents of Marxism, if they want to keep at least the show of being scientific, is very significant, as we meet with it not only in the province of philosophy of history but all along the line of sociology, including political economy, as we shall see later.

But it is not only the Nihilists among the Marx-critics who do not follow up their criticism with the only decisive proof, that mentioned by Engels, the proof of history. Instead, they indulge in generalities, such, for instance, as:—Marx gives "undue" "prominence" to the material factors and disregards factors which ought to be considered. Expressions that mean absolutely nothing, because of their indefiniteness, and are absolutely incapable of verification, by any method, except perhaps, the "subjective" one of everybody deciding for himself, according to his fancy, which factor got its "due," and which did not.

The slowness on the part of Marx-critics to talk more definitely is not due to any constitutional defects. These gentlemen are usually quite voluble. It is simply a case of discretion. Whenever they do say something definite it can easily be shown that either the historic facts do not bear out the critics or that Marx never said the things attributed to him. It seems that most of the critics of Marxism suffer with a singular malady which may be termed: "Confusion of Terms and Ideas," which makes them attribute to Marx and his disciples all sorts of things which neither Marx nor his disciples said or could have said, as appears plainly from their writings, with which their critics are very familiar. So do for instance, Professor Barth, Weisengruen and others, make, what they evidently regard as a very strong point against the Materialistic Conception of History by showing that

the changes in the technical development of the means of production can not, alone, explain all the facts of History. In this they are undoubtedly right. But,—and there is the rub,—the Marxists never claimed any such thing. The assumption that the Marxists do claim such a thing evidently rests on the confusion by the critics of the terms “economic conditions,” usually employed by the Marxists with the term “technical development.” A confusion which does not do much credit to the faculty of discrimination possessed by these gentlemen, and which seems most surprising in such acute and astute thinkers.

It seems peculiar that such a simple matter should require long explanations. But all Marx-critics seem to be so much affected by the disease referred to, that it is pretty dangerous business to take it for granted that they are able without outside aid to see the most obvious distinctions and differences. Be it therefore said here for the Nth time, that while changes in the technical development of the means of production usually go together with changes in the material conditions of the people, they do not necessarily so go together and are separate and distinct from each other. That while the technical developments in the means of production and distribution are the chief cause of changes in the material conditions of the people, they are not always so and not necessarily so. That there are other causes which may affect the material conditions of the people, and that there are changes in the technical part of production and distribution which do not at all affect the material conditions of the people. And that the Marxists claim that it is the changes in the “material conditions” that are the prime movers of history, no matter what the causes of these changes may be. The technical development only affects the course of history indirectly and only in so far as it causes changes in the material conditions under which people live and work.

From the same malady,—Confusion of Terms and Ideas,—springs another great objection to the Materialistic Conception of History. It is advanced with great vehemence by most critics of an “ethical” bent of mind. Among others, by the well-known English socialist, E. Belfort Bax. It is to the following effect: People do not always act out of self-interest. They are very often swayed by ideal motives and then act quite contrary to their own interests. Hence, the fatal error of the Materialistic Conception of History in making the “material interests” the prime movers of History.

This objection has been partly answered already in a previous article, where it was pointed out that the Materialistic Conception of History has nothing to do with the question of individual idealism. That it was not a theory explaining the motives which actuate individuals to act, but a historical theory explaining the

motive powers which bring about those actions of the masses, the aggregate of which make up what we call history, the powers which are the "causes of the causes" of individual action. A man may very well act against his own interest, even sacrifice himself, for the sake of an ideal, and yet his action may be the result of the material interests of a class or group which produced that ideal. For example: The ruling class of Japan needs new markets for its expanding industries. Russia is in its way because the ruling classes of Russia for some reason or other need the same markets. Japan and Russia go to war for the control of these markets. This begets a high patriotic fever in both countries, and thousands and tens of thousands of people sacrifice their lives willingly for the high ideal of "My country forever." Among those thousands there are very few who are directly "interested" in the issue of the war, and even these would probably never give away their lives for those "interests" if it were put up to them as a mere business proposition. Most of those who will sacrifice their lives in this war for the "honor" of their country will be people who have no "interest" in the war, who may be even affected injuriously by the war, but who sacrifice their lives for the high ideal born and begotten from the interests of their class, or of the ruling class under whose moral and intellectual tutelage their class stands. While the actions of the individual participants in the war is, therefore, the result of ideal motives, the historic event itself, the war, is the result of material interests, which are in their turn the result of economic conditions.

Aside from the confusion, however, between the motives of individuals and the motive powers of History, this objection also rests on the further confusion of "conditions" with "interests." The Marxists never said that material "interests" control the course of History. They always use the expression, "material conditions," and material conditions are something entirely different from material interests. Material conditions usually beget material "interests," which shape the course of History, but not always and not necessarily so. Sometimes material conditions will bring about historical phenomena which are not the result of any "interest" in the usual sense of that word, but merely of the condition itself. Karl Kautsky in a discussion with Belfort Bax used this example: The turning away from all earthly interests, the longing for death, of early Christianity may,—he says—very well be explained by the material *conditions* of the Roman Empire at that time. But it would, of course, be monstrous to attribute the longing for death to some material *interest*.

If the learned critics would only carefully refrain from substituting other terms and ideas in place of those used by Marx and his disciples a good deal of their criticism would have abso-

lutely no room, and the rest could easily be answered. So, for instance, would a careful reading of Marx and a clear comprehension of the terms used by him do away with all the objections which admit that the economic factor plays an important role in history but think that "too much" is claimed for it, and that other factors are "not taken into account."

So do most of the critics talk of Marx's failure to "take into account" such things as human nature, race, geography, etc. Those of our readers who have read carefully these articles will have seen that these things have all been "taken into account," and when the Marxists still insist upon the economic factor as the determining factor of historical progress it is because this factor is the only one which accounts for the *movement* of history, the *progress* of the human race from one state to another, as all the other factors are comparatively stationary, and could therefore account perhaps for a *condition* of the human race but not for its *Progression*.

That it was not any failure to "take" these things "into account" that led Marx to proclaim the economic factor as *the* material factor which *moves* history, a mere cursory reading of Marx will show. In his work on Capital, he says:

"Aside from the more or less developed condition of social production, the productivity of labor depends on natural conditions. They are all reducible to the nature of man himself, such as race, etc., and his natural surroundings. The outward natural conditions can be divided, economically, into two great classes; natural wealth in the means of subsistence, such as richness of soil, fish-abounding waters, etc.; and natural wealth in means of production, such as usable water-falls, navigable rivers, woods, metals, coal, etc. In a primitive community the first class of natural wealth is of paramount importance, on a higher plane of civilization it is the second-class that is the most important."

To insist after this on the "technical development" being the only historical factor recognized by Marxists would seem absurd. But Marx critics are a peculiar race. There is nothing that they cannot do, or at least say. From what was said in the preceding articles it would seem clear that Marx and his disciples not only recognize the influence of ideas, but accentuate it, and that in their scheme of the transition of the capitalist system into socialism, ideas play a distinct and quite important role. And yet most of the critics still tell the old yarn of Marxists not admitting the influence of ideas. Furthermore, they are not a bit abashed when they are shown by quotations from Marx that he thought just the other way. When they are caught "with the goods on," they very coolly declare that Marx is contradicting himself. That is, the Marx of "Capital" and other well-known works, is contradicting the Marx which they put up for their readers' delecta-

tion. Indeed, lately this business of "refuting Marx by Marx" has developed into a special industry, which would contribute a good deal to the gayety of nations if they were only in the mood for it. As it is, the "nations" which read these things are worried too much by the subject-matter to be amused. It will, however, be amusing to our readers, and we shall attend to these "contradictions" in due time. We must, however, defer this treat until the time when we will come to consider the Marxian system in its entirety, as a reward to our readers for their patience. Besides, it will then be better appreciated. Here, we will mention only one as an example:

The Russian critic Ludwig Slonimski finds this contradiction: Marx,—he says—put up the theory that economic and class interests are the only motives of the political and legislative activity of the State, and yet, he himself, tells us of the praiseworthy activities of some factory inspectors, particularly Leonard Horner, who, he says, deserved well of the working class for protecting their interests!

Is it not really surprising that Marx is still thought of a good deal in some quarters, and that people generally refuse to accept the decision of M. Slonimski who announces that: "No matter how much the admirers and followers of Marx, who believe in the scientific character of his method may protest, the truth is that he merely created a Utopia which is vulgar in its nature and is only suited to the narrow horizon of ordinary workingmen and to the notions of the imagination of those who see in the amount of pay they receive for their labor the highest blessing?"

We will also leave for future consideration the question of the "modification" of the Marxian theories at the hands of their authors, of which there is so much talk in the literature of Revisionism. These supposed "modifications" are really nothing more than an attempt to make the supposed contradictions plausible, and deserve to take their place right alongside of them. We will, therefore, limit ourselves at this place to objections springing from mere confusion of terms and ideas. We want to say again, however, that the malady is so general with Marx-critics, and its ravages so extensive that it is absolutely impossible even to recount them properly, not to say analyze them all, and we will perforce be compelled to attend only to some shining examples. There are some individual writers who at least by volume, if by nothing else, have won for themselves a place of honor in the roster of Marx-critics, and we will have to return to them again when occasion offers. So, for instance, Professor Masaryk, to whom we intend to devote a separate article later on. Here we only wish to add to the confusionists already mentioned, our own Professor E. R. A. Seligman of Columbia University, Presi-

dent of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, etc., etc., who has written what our book-reviewers call "a very readable" little book entitled "The Economic Interpretation of History." It must be admitted that Professor Seligman, being an American, believes in fair play, and that he is "eminently fair" and even generous to Marx. With this, however, and perhaps, because of it, he is exceedingly superficial, and scandalously confused. I shall return to the gentleman at some future time after the conclusion of the present series of articles, when I shall discuss the question of "monism" in history, of which he treats. I do not consider it properly within the bounds of the present discussion, for the reason that the question of "monism" is not one which affects the Materialistic Conception of History alone. It affects the idealistic conception of history just as well. In other words, it is a question that affects philosophy in general. As such it also affects the materialistic conception of history, but it is not an objection exclusively directed against Marxism,—our present topic of discussion. Of course, all these questions are inter-dependent, particularly with the confused mode of treatment pursued by most Marx-critics, who usually serve up in their writings a Hungarian Gulosh or an American hash of objections of all sorts and kinds thrown together. Here, therefore, is, for the present, a mere taste of our American Marx-critic. We will serve the preparation in its original wrapper, and let the readers dissect or analyze for themselves. He says:

"All human progress is at bottom mental progress; all changes must go through the human mind. There is thus an undoubted psychological basis for all human evolution. The question, however, still remains: what determines the thought of humanity? * * * This claim (that all sociology must be based exclusively on economics, and that all social life is nothing but a reflex of economic life) can not be countenanced for the obvious reason that economics deal with only one kind of social relations and that there are as many kinds of social relations as there are classes of social wants. We have not only economic wants, but also moral, religious, jural, political and many other kinds of collective wants; we have not only collective wants, but individual wants, like physical, technical, aesthetic, scientific, philosophical wants. The term 'utility,' which has been appropriated by the economist, is not by any means peculiar to him. Objects may have not only an economic utility, but a physical, aesthetic, scientific, technical, moral, religious, jural, political or philosophical utility. The value which is the expression of this utility and which forms the subject-matter of economics is only one subdivision of a far greater class. For all the world is continually rating objects and ideas according to their aesthetic, scientific, technical, moral, religious, jural, political or philosophical value without giving any thought to their economic value. So far as utility and value are social in character, that is, so far as they depend upon the relation of man to man, they form the subject-matter of sociology. Economics deals with only one kind of social utilities or values, and can therefore not explain all kinds of social utilities or values. The strands of human life are manifold and complex.

"In this aspect what is untrue of the individual can not be true of the group of individuals. We have passed beyond the time when it was

incumbent to explain the fallacy lurking in the phrase 'the economic man.' There is indeed an economic life and an economic motive—the motive which leads every human being to satisfy his wants with the least outlay of effort. But it is no longer necessary to show that the individual is impelled by other motives than the economic one, and that the economic motive itself is not everywhere equally strong, or equally free from the admixture of other influences. A full analysis of all the motives that influence men, even in their economic life, would test the powers of the social psychologist. There is no 'economic man,' just as there is no 'theological man.' The merchant has family ties just as the clergyman has an appetite. * * *

"In one sense, accordingly, there are as many methods of interpreting history as there are classes of human activities or wants. There is not only an economic interpretation of history, but an ethical, an aesthetic, a political, a jural, a linguistic, a religious and a scientific interpretation of history. Every scholar can thus legitimately regard past events from his own peculiar standpoint."

Has anybody ever been across a greater mix-up of truths, half-truths, untruths, platitudes and meaninglessness? Whatever may be said as to whether or not "the strands of human life are manifold and complex," one thing is quite certain: Human life is too short for one man to attempt to unravel all this nonsense.

If all changes (Changes of what? Of environment or of environment into institutions or ideas?) must go *through* the human mind but do not originate there, why is all human progress *at bottom* mental progress? Isn't the thing which changes, and its changes which go *through* the human mind, at the *bottom* of human progress, and the mental progress, the result of these changes going *through* the human mind, only the *top* of human progress? Is not Marx right when he insists that the changes which go *through* the human mind are the *basis* of all social progress?

What does he mean by "social wants" and "collective wants," and are these terms interchangeable? And why does he slide down from social or collective wants to individual wants? Does he mean to say that the Materialistic Conception of History is incorrect because it does not explain or "take into account" individual wants? What does he mean by "technical" want as an individual want? Does he mean to say that Physical and Technical "wants" (whatever these may mean) are not material wants? Are not technical relations exclusively social and economic relations? Doesn't the learned professor know that some Marx-critics, among them his distinguished colleague, Professor Barth, object to the Materialistic Conception of History because the technical development alone does not explain history? And who is right? Professor Barth, according to whom the "technical development" is all there is of Marx's explanation; or Professor Seligman, who objects to Marx's explanation because it does not include the "technical wants?" Will the gentleman kindly vouchsafe an explanation of "scientific" want, "philosophic" want, and "jural" want? What does he mean by "Jural" relations? Does

he mean the social relations as expressed in codes of positive law? If so, does not he know that these laws deal almost exclusively with the property relations of people, which are certainly material and economical relations; and that the few exceptions "deal" in "morality;" that whatever "jural" relations there may be are to all intents and purposes economic relations, even according to his own view of them, and that *all* jural relations are necessarily contained in the economic and moral relations, indeed, are their expressions?

What does Professor Seligman mean by suddenly, without warning or explanation, substituting "economics" for economic interpretation of history, and in talking of "economic," "economists," "utility," "value," as if the materialistic conception of history were an explanation of history by means of the special science known as political economy? Does he mean to say that there is any warrant in Marx even for a suggestion of this kind, or does he simply speculate on the ignorance of his readers who probably know nothing about Marx, except that he was a writer on political economy? And is that why he first changed the Materialistic Conception of History into an "Economic Interpretation of History?" Is it all intentional confusion, or is he really so confused? And why does he tell the Marxists "that it is no longer necessary to show that the individual is impelled by other motives than the economic one," have not they themselves reiterated this for the benefit of their critics *ad nauseam* And hasn't Marx himself put the "economic man" to rest in his grave, from which the opponents of Marx are now trying to raise him? As an economist he ought to know these things. But if the demise of the "economic man," and the attempts at his resuscitation have not been noted in Professor Seligman's statistical department, why didn't he inform himself of it from his friend, Professor John B. Clark?

What does he mean by a "linguistic" explanation of history, and is that based on a "linguistic" relation which is the result of a "linguistic" want? What does he mean by a "religious" explanation of history, besides an "ethical" one, (whatever *that* may mean)? Does he mean a creed or church explanation? And does he really mean that a "scholar" can "thus legitimately" "regard past events" from such a "standpoint?" And does he really think that notwithstanding all this, there is still room for a "scientific" interpretation of history?

There are some other very interesting questions we might ask Professor Seligman, but the strands of human life being so manifold and complex, as Professor Seligman truly observes, and the Marx-critics being so many and so multifarious, we must leave him in peace, particularly as he probably meant no harm. But before leaving him we must ask him what has become

of his quest for the cause which "determines the thought of humanity," with which he started out? Has he forgotten all about it? And yet, that was *the* question under consideration!

That was *the* question to be considered, if he was really anxious to find a scientific explanation of history, or, rather, if he wanted to treat history scientifically. But that is just what modern Marx-critics are extremely anxious to avoid. Hence, their plea for all sorts of "standpoints," "factors," etc., etc., which they themselves do not define or explain, but which serve the general purpose of making the scientific treatment of history impossible. In this even such extremes as Seligman and Weisengruen agree. Except that while the superficial and democratic American is "easy" with the historians, and announces that any tommyrot, written from any "standpoint," is as good science as anything else; the thorough and conservative German makes the task of the historian impossible of accomplishment by claiming that scientific history must contain things which it is impossible for it to contain, and which, if it were possible to put them in there, would make it absurd.

Weisengruen objects to the theory of the class-struggle. But not because there is no such struggle. Oh, no! That there is a struggle of the classes into which society is at present divided he can no more deny than Seligman can deny that the economic relations of society are the principal motive-power of History. But just as Seligman finds other "relations" which enable him to write history from all sorts of "standpoints," so does Weisengruen find all sorts of struggles which he claims must be "taken into account" by a scientific historian. These struggles, which, according to Weisengruen, go to make up real history, are not merely social struggles but also struggles between individuals, and are of every nature and description. His demands upon scientific history are, therefore, so many that they cannot all be recounted here. Here are some of them, as a sample:

The "scientific" historian must embrace, with an "intuitive" gaze, the real essence of the period of which he desires to treat, and must at the same time be able to correctly measure its "psychical range." He must know every occurrence, even the smallest; and must be acquainted with every document, even of the least importance. And in order that the reader may not think lightly of this task, Weisengruen takes care to warn him of the insuperable difficulties which will beset the scientific historian. And those difficulties are indeed insuperable. For it must be remembered that Weisengruen does not refer to social occurrences, or public documents. No, he means *every individual occurrence* of any kind or description, and *every private document* of whatever import. Quarrels between husband and wife, neighborly gossip, love-letters, everything is here included. *And*

everything about everything. For our author has suddenly grown very democratic, and insists that everybody makes history. Nothing is so mean, nor is any station in life so lowly, as not to influence the course of history. In order that there be no mistake about it, he gives the following express instructions: "*He (the historian) must know all the persons (of the period he describes), their family relations, their actual course of action, as well as the opinions they held of each other.. All to the smallest detail.*"

Then he must know everything about everything else in creation: All sorts of relations between all sorts of groups in society, covering all the social relations of the people, the economic structure of society, the politics, ideas, sciences, etc., etc., and everything to the minutest detail. The Marxists also demand knowledge of all these social matters but Weisengruen does not mean it that way at all. No. He is a thoroughgoing scientist, as we have already seen, and therefore the historian's knowledge of social matters which he demands must be on a par with his knowledge of individuals and their relations as already hinted at. For instance, the historian must not only be acquainted with the tools, manner and processes of production in use, and the things produced during the period of which he treats, but he must have an actual inventory of all the "goods, wares and merchandise," as well as of all the household furniture, clothing and other worldly goods, possessed by each and every person who lived during that period, with all of whom, as we already know, the historian must be personally acquainted.

If this is not materialism run mad, what is it?

Of course, Weisengruen knows the absurdity of all this. And this would never have been said if it were not for the terrible plight in which he found himself in attempting to disprove the claim of the Materialistic Conception of History to the sole and exclusive possession of the attribute *science*, in its own proper field. Weisengruen's madness has method. All this moonshine is put up to us in all seriousness for one purpose only. If all this is impossible, and there is no denying that fact, then scientific treatment of history is impossible until some dim and distant future of which we can take no cognizance. And meanwhile, (and there is the rub), there is no science, and anybody and everybody has license to write any rot he pleases from any "standpoint" he pleases....

You see, we are at the same old game again....

Weisengruen and Seligman, Masaryk and Slonimski, and the rest of the tribe, are essentially alike. Whether by way of ponderous philosophic moonshine, or elegant phrase-mongering, the flow of objections to the Materialistic Conception of History runs from the same source, and it wends its course towards the same objective point.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)

Wisconsin and Her Critics.

A great deal of criticism is being offered of late upon the Wisconsin Socialists. It is claimed in some quarters that the state platform is not up to standard and that the recent action in the matter of the judicial election is a violation of socialist ethics. This also is made an occasion for raising other questions in regard to the state, and altogether it seems quite in place to inquire into the peculiar nature of the Wisconsin movement.

This is not the first time that Wisconsin has been criticised. The writer remembers very distinctly what a storm of protest arose when the Socialists of Wisconsin adopted a municipal program. Immediately individual socialists and rigid "revolutionary" locals rushed into print with loud and insistent resolutions, denouncing the municipal platform as "utopian," "middle-class," "unscientific," etc. The national organization at its convention appointed a committee that drafted a report on "suggested lines of socialist municipal activity." But it was put forth with reservations and with a sort of half apology and a distinct disavowal of any intention to make it even a suggestion, and "least of all does it partake of the character of a proposed platform." Sometime before this the Milwaukee comrades had adopted a municipal platform with the usual "immediate demands." They were compelled to do this in spite of the fact that they knew it would be assailed by the impractical and the doctrinaire. The criticism came in a storm and from the usual sources. But everyone who had a knowledge of the socialist movement in other countries knew that Milwaukee was right and it is now acknowledged so. And now St. Louis, Chicago, Minneapolis and indeed the Socialist Party of almost any city can quite safely copy the Milwaukee municipal platform or write a similar one.

At another time there was a terrible storm of criticism about the working program or so-called "immediate demands" in the Wisconsin platform. This criticism was, of course, a part of the general fight for a program all through the country and Wisconsin had many allies. But the criticism was fierce and menacing enough. And it continues even yet in some quarters. We are only a few months away from the Omaha manifesto.

All this criticism was made as usual in the name of scientific, class-conscious, revolutionary, clear-cut socialism. And this in

spite of the fact that Marx and Engels themselves wrote a long list of "immediate demands" into the communistic manifesto itself. (See page 45 Kerr edition, or 33 Debs edition).

These critics of Wisconsin socialism tore their hair and grew red in the face denouncing the platform that had the working program, because they said it was not in accord with international socialism. In one case, in a western city that has since grown famous for its ridiculous criticism of our present national platform, a very "revolutionary" comrade shook a copy of Liebknecht's pamphlet on "Socialism, What it is and What it seeks to Accomplish" into the writer's face, and exclaimed, "This is international socialism! This shows your middle class 'immediate demands' to be nothing but treason to the working class." I drew a duplicate copy from my own pocket and read from it the platform of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. It contains forty-two "immediate demands." Readers will find translation of this, which is the Erfurter Program, on pages 27 and 28 of the pamphlet above referred to.

The critics of the "immediate demands," who are in every case the same individuals who have all along so fiercely assailed Wisconsin, when confronted with the fact that Marx, Engels, Liebknecht and the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, were with Wisconsin and against their impossibilism, began muttering something about the German Socialist movement not being quite up to snuff. It took a little nerve for these American pigmies to pronounce against Marx, Engels, Liebknecht and the German movement of fifty years of experience and scientific research. But an impossibilist is capable of anything. "Fools rush in where angels dare not tread." So they took a change of venue and went over to France, Belgium and other nations and here they declared we had the pure quill.

But this serves them no better. The platform of the French Socialist Party adopted at Tours in March, 1902, is even longer than the German program and contains even more of the immediate demands. The Belgian program is still "worse"—to speak from the standpoint of the impossibilist. It is two years later than the Erfurter program having been adopted in 1893, and is perhaps the most perfect in form and constructive in nature of any socialist platform in the world. One who has listened to the jargon of the American impossibilists and hasn't taken time to look these matters up, will be surprised when he reads the Belgian platform. The Austrian Social-Democratic Party at its conference at Brunn in 1891 is just as "bad" as any of the rest. In England the Social Democratic Federation adopted a revised platform in 1903; the Independent Labor Party adopted theirs in 1903-4; and the Fabian Society revised their so-called "Basis" in 1900, but however much these parties and platforms may differ

they all have a long list of immediate demands. Comrades who care to make a comparative study of the platforms of the various international socialist bodies will find them translated in a recent volume by R. C. K. Ensor,—“Modern Socialism, As Set Forth by Socialists in Their Speeches, Writings and Programs,” published by Harper and Bro.

So it comes to this, that there isn't a group of socialists anywhere in the world that has a platform without a program of immediate demands, except that little coterie of fanatics that worship at the shrine of the discredited De Leon, and the impossibilists. And yet Wisconsin has been bitterly assailed for doing what every section of the real socialist movement of the world has found absolutely necessary and right.

Still more recently Wisconsin has been criticised fiercely for a provision in its state platform to have congress nationalize certain great monopolies and pay the actual value for the same. This, of course, is a dreadful insult to the doctrinaire impossibilist who dismisses the whole program of socialism and the whole question of transition, the whole struggle for economic emancipation with two words—“revolution and confiscation.” And yet Karl Kautsky, Emil Vandervelde, Wilhelm Liebknecht and even Karl Marx himself, talk of compensation. Why should Wisconsin be assailed for a position taken by men of this kind, and besides, this is only a question of the program for this year. If we could get these monopolies by buying them this year, we would gladly do so. Next year it may be necessary to change our program.

Engels wrote in 1894,—“We do not consider the indemnification of the proprietors as an impossibility whatever may be the circumstances. How many times has not Karl Marx expressed to me the opinion that if we could buy up the whole crowd it would really be the cheapest way of relieving ourselves of them.”

Vandervelde says,—“There is no doubt that the expropriation without indemnity with the resistance, the troubles, the bloody disturbances which it would not fail to produce would be in the end the most costly.” (Collectivism, page 155.)

In discussing this question of compensation, Karl Kautsky says in his Social Revolution, page 118,—“There are a number of reasons which indicate that a proletarian regime will seek the road of compensation and payment of the capitalists and land-owners.” In another place, page 113, “A portion of the factories, mines, etc., could be sold directly to the laborers who are working them, and could be henceforth operated cooperatively; another portion could be sold to cooperatives of distribution, and still another to the communities or to the states. It is clear, however, that capital would find its most extensive and generous purchaser in the states or municipalities and for this very reason the majority of the industries would pass into the possession of

the states and municipalities. That the Social Democrats when they came into control would strive consciously for this solution is well recognized,"—except in America.

So here again it comes to this that the position taken by the Wisconsin comrades is quite in accord with the best and ripest thought of the Socialist movement of the world.

Again, it was the Wisconsin comrades who first developed a farmers program. And this too has been the subject of fierce criticism. In one case a whole state committee went to the extreme length of refusing charters to locals upon no other ground than the applicants were farmers. And as usual this too was done in the name of scientific international socialism. And there is at this time in certain quarters even yet an inclination to look with suspicion upon the effort to enlist and organize the agricultural working class into the Socialist movement. And yet upon this matter too, it is the Wisconsin movement that is first to square itself with the best thought of the best socialists in the world. No less a writer than Liebknecht is found saying in his pamphlet on "What is Socialism" above referred to;—"And mark well, under working people we do not understand merely the hand workers, but every one who does not live on the labor of another. Besides the city and country laborers, must be included also the small farmers and traders who groan under the burden of capital even as the laborers proper. Yes; in many cases yet more." (Page 5.) He saw, what Wisconsin sees, that the economic interests of a great majority of the farmers lie with the wage earners in socialism.

In view of the fact that 40 per cent of the voters of America are on the farm, while only 25 per cent of the voters are furnished by the workers in commerce, mining and similar industries (Simons, "American Farmer" page 161 and 155, also Mills's "Struggle for Existence" chapter XXXII and paragraph 605); and, farther, in view of the fact that 90 per cent of all those engaged in agriculture are exploited to as great an extent as the wage workers in other countries (Mills, paragraphs 441 to 443); and in view of the fact that as Simons says,—"It is certain that within any period that can be calculated upon as effected by the present social and economic movements, we will have to deal with agriculture in America as conducted by a class of owners of small farms" (American Farmer, page 114); in view of these facts the proposition to refuse farmers admission to the socialist movement is only in degree less absurd than to criticise a body of socialists for undertaking to adapt their appeal to them. Sooner or later we must secure the cooperation of these agricultural voters and the effort to adapt our propaganda to this phase of our problem should receive the assistance and not the rebuke of our comrades.

But here as everywhere, the constructive socialists must encounter the carping criticism, the tirade and the ridicule of the doctrinaire and the shallow minded. All sorts of derogatory epithets are hurled at us. We are "populists!" Bernsteins!" "opportunists!" "single-taxers," "green-backers," etc., etc. And all this because we set ourselves diligently to the task of understanding the conditions and needs of the farmer, and of adapting ourselves and our propaganda to them. But this effort, like all the others referred to above, is strictly in accord with the best thought of the best men in the international socialist movement. The Belgian Socialist Party has a long and carefully elaborated farmers program. This includes such things as 'insurance against epizootic diseases, diseases of plants, hail, floods and other agricultural risks, organization of cooperation securities to assist in buying machinery, seed, manure, etc., etc. The same is true of the platform of the French Socialist Party. In Germany there has been a decided advance in this direction. At the Congress at Frankfort in 1894, a strong committee was appointed to study the Agrarian question and lay proposals before the next congress. This committee had on it men of such recognized standing in the international socialist movement as Bebel, Liebknecht, David, Von Vollmar and a long draft of proposals was submitted. They were finally rejected. But another committee was appointed; and the fact that these measures were proposed, and by men of such recognized leadership, shows that even the German movement is a long way in advance of the doctrinaire position of those who criticise a farmers program.

And now finally Wisconsin is criticised for not putting a ticket in the field at the last judicial election, and comrade Victor L. Berger, is arraigned for editorially advising socialists to vote against a certain capitalist candidate after it was decided by the party not to go into the election. In this criticism the same voices have been raised, the same haste and ill temper shown and the same lack of appreciation of the principles which have lead the socialists of other countries to do identically the same thing. All sorts of drastic things have been proposed, from removal from the National executive committee to expulsion from the party. And that in spite of the fact that the action has been no violation either of the state or national platforms or constitution nor of the principles of the international movement. In reply to all the talk about disloyalty to international socialism it is sufficient to say that in hundreds of cases in Germany, France, Belgium and indeed in every country where the socialist movement has really developed the comrades have done over and over again exactly what Milwaukee and Victor L. Berger did this spring.

In all these different criticisms which have been raised against Wisconsin, there seem to be several peculiar elements, all of them

evidences of weakness. In the first place, there are the elements of ignorance on the part of those who are too careless or lazy or indifferent to take time to read the works of the authoritative writers of the international movement.

As a rule, the loudest criticisms come from this source. And in that case it is simply the effrontery of stupidity. Then again, there seem to be those of our comrades who are convinced of the correctness of the positions held by the Wisconsin comrades and their friends, but seem to lack the courage of their convictions and so allow themselves to be drawn into the usual stream of adverse criticism. In that case it is sheer intellectual cowardice. And finally, there are those who are new in the movement and have not had an opportunity for sufficient study of the principles of the party here and elsewhere to ground them well, and, in their sincere anxiety to be right they act with the parties that make the biggest noise. This is only the weakness of youth.

None of these elements of weakness need be serious. Inevitably as the comrades study more and as knowledge of the principles and tactics of the international movement increase these elements of weakness will disappear. But, meanwhile, it is the duty of every socialist comrade to inform himself upon these matters, to read the great writers of the socialist movement and help to put the Socialist Party of America past the doctrinaire stage of petty controversy.

CARL D. THOMPSON.

Evolution of the Theory of Evolution.

(Continued.)

These first half-conscious movements of proletarian thought were as immature as capitalism itself was. But they were at least unmistakably proletarian, and this fact makes the utopias of these three men superior to the dreams of Plato and More. Historically, these French and English utopians excelled also their followers, such as Bellamy and Groenlund, in keenness of perception and political influence. All the attempts at independent proletarian movements in the beginning of the 19th century connected themselves with the ideas of these prophets of social revolution. Philosophically, these men were the heirs of Locke and of his French school. Whoever is looking for the roots of the modern socialist philosophy, must seek them here. No one knew this as well as the founders of scientific socialism. Some of the modern socialists are of the opinion that the socialist philosophy took its departure from the German classical philosophy. But Marx and Engels knew better, and Engels entitled his book on Feuerbach advisedly "Feuerbach and the Outcome of German Classical Philosophy," and declared that the modern proletariat was the "heir" of this philosophy. The English translator of this work, by transforming this title into the "Roots of the Socialist Philosophy," committed a violation of a historical truth, which both Marx and Engels had fully acknowledged. Scientific Socialism rejected the classical philosophy of Germany, took its departure from the humanism of Feuerbach, and connected itself with the materialist philosophy of the 18th century.

This acknowledgment was made by Marx and Engels, in "The Holy Family," in these words: "Just as Cartesian materialism leads to French natural science, so the other school of French materialism leads directly to socialism and communism. It requires no great keenness of perception to realize that the doctrines of materialism relative to the original goodness and equal intellectual endowment of men, to the omnipotence of experience, habit, education, and the influence of external circumstances on men, the great importance of industry, the justification of enjoyment, etc., lead necessarily to a connection with communism and socialism. If man gets all his knowledge and feeling, etc., from the world of sense perceptions and his contact with it, then the thing to do is to arrange matters in the material world in such

a way, that he gets truly human impressions from it, acquires them as habits, and realizes his human nature. If the correct understanding of material interests is the basic principle of all morality, then the private interests of man must be made to coincide with general human interests. If the human race is unfree in the sense that the materialists use this term, that is to say if he is free, not so much by his negative power to avoid this or that, but rather by his positive power to assert his true individuality, then it is not proper to punish the crimes of the individual, but to destroy the antisocial breeding grounds of crime and to secure for every one the social room for his essential life expressions. If man is formed by external circumstances, then circumstances must be modeled to suit man. If man is by nature social, then he can develop his true nature only in society, and the power of his nature must not be judged by individuals, but by that of his societies. These and similar statements are found almost literally in the works of even the oldest French materialists.... Fourier takes his departure immediately from the teachings of the French materialists. The Babouvists were crude and uncivilized materialists, but even the developed communism starts directly from French materialism. The latter emigrated, in the form given to it by Helvetius, to its mother country, England. Bentham founded his system of well understood interests on the ethics of Helvetius, and Owen, starting from the system of Bentham, founded English communism. Exiled to England, the Frenchman Cabet was stimulated by the communist ideas of his exile and on his return to France became the most popular, although the most superficial, representative of communism. The scientific French communists, Dezamy, Gay, etc., developed, like Owen, the teachings of materialism into those of realistic humanism and into the logical basis of communism."

The close of the 18th century was marked by two discoveries which left their imprint on science for a full hundred years. First, the introduction of vaccination as a preventive against smallpox, by Jenner, in 1796, stirred up the old bones in medicine, and in the second place, the invention of the Voltaic pile by Volta, in 1799 revived the interest in electricity. Jenner's idea showed, that the futility of the prevailing symptomatic treatment of diseases was being realized, but his method was itself still a fight against symptoms, instead of a removal of causes. It must be admitted, that it was the best that could be done under the prevailing historical conditions, for capitalism limits all human activity to more or less symptomatic methods. One hundred years of practical experience with vaccination and similar preventive methods have demonstrated, that the scientific way to treat diseases is to remove their causes, and this understanding found

its logical application in the revolutionary method of the class-conscious proletariat.

Volta's invention was the forerunner of great discoveries in experimental physics, all of which were so many little stones in the beautiful mosaic of a monistic conception of the universe. Ever since Franklin had made his experiments with lightning, scientists had studied the atmospheric phenomena and investigated the nature of electricity. Rumford, in 1798, and Davy, in 1799, published the results of their experiments on the nature of heat. Thomas Young established the undulatory theory of ether by explaining the interference of light. And Dalton, who had elaborated his atomic theory in chemistry in 1803 and communicated it to Thomas Thompson in 1804, published his "New System of Chemical Philosophy" in 1808.

The fundamental laws, which dominated the physics and chemistry of the 19th century, were thus established. It was not until the beginning of the 20th century, that doubts as to the soundness of these three theories were expressed and the desire for their reconsideration became strong enough to lead to a greater accuracy in terms and definitions. Dalton made a new departure in chemical methods, and gave rise to two schools. One of them devoted itself to chemistry, the other to physics. The first result of Dalton's methods in chemistry was the practical determination of atomic weights by Berzelius, begun in 1811. And in physics, Gay Lussac and Avogadro modified the Daltonian theory profoundly. Gay Lussac showed in 1808, that combination between gases always takes place in simple relations by volume, and that all gaseous densities are proportional either to the combined weights of the various substances, or to rational multiples of their weights. And Avogadro generalized the new ideas in 1811 and announced his law that "equal volumes of gas, under like conditions, of temperature and pressure, contain an equal number of molecules. At the same time, the principle of classification, adopted by natural science, worked its way into economics, politics, and law. These specialists were little aware of the fact, that they were contributing their share to a monistic conception of all phenomena in the universe, and undermining inch by inch the foundation on which the theological belief in supernatural miracles rested.

Capitalism was now in its ascending stage, and its technical requirements in transportation and markets soon led to an improvement of steam engines and means of general communication. Fitch made an unsuccessful attempt to introduce steam navigation on the Delaware, in 1790. The first steamboat on the Clyde and Forth was launched by Symington, in 1802. And finally Fulton steamed up the Hudson, in 1807, and succeeded where Fitch had

failed. The first locomotive was placed into practical commission in 1804, and the discovery that smooth wheels were better for railroads than toothed wheels was made in 1813. Then came the first successful trip of a train drawn by a locomotive, made by Stephenson in 1829. Improvements in railroading were accompanied by the invention of the telegraph and telephone, the credit for which is due to Wheatstone, Oersted, Henry, Morse, Edison and Bell. Steam navigation across the Atlantic ocean was inaugurated in 1838, and the first trans-Atlantic cable between Europe and North America was completed in 1866. The postal and telegraph systems came rapidly into use, with cheap postage and mailing facilities. Capitalism penetrated into the remotest hamlets, created a world after its own image wherever it went, and at the same time abolished the element of distance in human intercourse.

From now on, scientific exploration trips to every quarter of the globe became a permanent feature of human life, and a network of scientific stations was spread over the surface of the earth from pole to pole. The tropics and the frigid zones, the highest mountain ranges and the hidden valleys, the depths of the seas and the interior of the earth, were compelled to give up their secrets. Every unknown territory was invaded, and a steady stream of facts began to flow into the studies of the scientists. Soon hundreds of thousands of minds and hands were busy accumulating, sifting, classifying evidence, and theorizing on it. One startling discovery after another followed in bewildering succession. It would require volumes to appreciate the merits of even the most remarkable accomplishments of science, in the 19th century, for the formulation of a monistic conception of the world.

Specialization became an inevitable result of this activity. Among many new departments in science, the 19th century gave birth to that specialty, which has done more than any other to bring the nature of the human faculty of understanding into reach of empirical methods and take away the last mystical ground on which the theory of a supernatural soul rested. That specialty is biology. This term was first employed by Threviranus, who selected for his life's work the creation of a new science, which should study the forms and phenomena of *life*, its origin, and the conditions and laws of its existence. In his "Biology, or Philosophy of Living Nature," published in 1802, he defined life as the "uniformity of reactions on unlike stimuli of the outer world." He thereby established a principle in natural science, which has been all too frequently overlooked by scientists and philosophers, namely the interrelation of the individual and its environment. But a few remembered it and used it with the most revolutionary effect. The living animal and plant now became the objects of

study as well as the dead, and the most intimate processes of nature were stripped one by one of their mysterious character.

It is interesting to note, though quite natural from our point of view that, the ideas of the ancient natural philosophers re-appeared simultaneously with the new accomplishment of science. Irrespective of confessional differences, scientists of various nations returned to materialists and monist methods. And evolutionary ideas unavoidably accompanied this tendency, for as we have seen, the ancient natural philosophers were all more or less imbued with evolutionary (dialectic) ideas.

When Goethe published his "Metamorphosis of Plants," in 1790, he intimated that a mysterious law indicated the interrelation and common descent of all plants from one primeval type. And in his "Metamorphosis of Animals," he made the same claims in regard to the origin of animals. This was but a return of the human mind, after a long and fruitless drift around a circle, to the ideas of the Grecian natural philosophers. But now the facts for an empirical proof of this theory were within reach, and were soon to be marshalled against the Mosaic theories, which had dominated the human mind since the advent of the medieval church to power.

In 1809, Lamarck came forth with his "*Philosophie Zoologique*" and developed the theory of natural evolution systematically. He struck first of all a crushing blow at the metaphysical conception of the mysterious nature of life, which the naturalists of the 18th century had attributed to a supernatural vital force. He opposed this idea of vitalism by the theory that the primeval ancestors of living beings on this globe were the simplest organisms imaginable and were generated spontaneously by the interaction of physical causes, as soon as the globe had cooled sufficiently. Half a century later, such simple organisms were actually discovered, and still fifty years later the first life processes were produced by mechanical means in the laboratory.

According to Lamarck, those simple primeval organisms were gradually transformed through changes in their conditions of life, leading to the greater use of some and to the disuse of other organs, to adaptations to changed environments, and to the transmission of new characters thus acquired by way of heredity. Similar ideas were advanced by Geoffroy Saint Hilaire and Oken. The misfortune of these pioneers of resurrected evolution was, that the palaeontological and embryological material for the substantiation of this theory was not yet sufficient to silence the opposition. And as the new ideas were at once violently assailed by reactionary thought, the champions of the new science had a hard stand. When Cuvier, the founder of comparative anatomy, challenged Geoffroy Saint Hilaire, in 1830, to a public debate, the

old ideas of the Mosaic creation theory carried the day and remained victors for thirty years longer.

But the general results of Cuvier's own specialty, comparative anatomy, led to the elaboration of a natural system of classification, which stands as an eloquent proof of the interrelation of forms claimed by Lamarck. And the flimsy foundation of Cuvier's arguments was further shaken by the progress in other lines of science. In 1830, Lyell established the proofs of imperceptible and continuous development in geology and pulled the crude catastrophic theory of Cuvier to shreds. And Humphrey Davy had already suggested in 1809, that matter might be of a much more complex structure than was generally assumed. He also intimated that matter might become radiant through very great velocity. Faraday made similar statements in 1816, but his work "On the Magnetization of Light and the Illumination of the Magnetic Lines of Force" did not appear until 1845. Ten years later he discovered the laws of electrolysis. These steps led directly to the theory of electrons and ions, and with these charged particles of matter the entire theory of atoms assumed a new aspect. Light and heat, electricity and magnetism, now appeared as very close relatives, and it required but a few steps more to establish the identity of all life's phenomena with electricity, magnetism, and radiation.

These conditions were at once reflected in philosophy. It was Hegel whose works marked the next milestone after Kant. Hegel's "Phenomenology of the Mind" appeared in 1817. His "Science of Logic" followed in 1812-16, his "Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences" in 1817, his "Philosophy of Right" and "Philosophy of Religion" in 1821, and his maturest work, the "Philosophy of History," in 1827. This last work differs from all previous historical works by its distinct recognition of evolution, although it does not understand the means by which the evolution of human societies is brought about. From now on, the world and society were regarded dialectically, that is to say as a succession of processes following one out of another. Things were no longer mere *static*, but also *dynamic and dialectic*.

But unfortunately, the mystical ideas were still predominating. The reaction after the French revolution had produced a profound dissatisfaction with materialism in the bourgeois mind, and as natural science had not yet permitted the materialist evolutionists to triumph, the indescribable longing of the bourgeoisie for the consolations of idealism and mysticism impressed itself on the thinkers of the day in a very forcible manner, especially since the proletariat was showing a decided affinity for materialism and plain speech. Too late did the French and German bourgeois realize, what the English capitalist class had understood a

hundred years before, namely that "religion must be preserved for the people."

Under these circumstances, Hegel became an idealist. To him the life processes of the human brain, the production and realization of ideas, appeared as the evolution of *The Absolute Idea*, of the absolute mind, which was the real and only ruler of the universe, while the things which the human mind perceived, and this mind itself, were but unreal imaginations of the Absolute Idea. Of course Hegel had also to analyze Kant's proofs for the existence of a god, as well as the proofs of the metaphysicians and theologians, in order to establish his theory. He made short work of them all by turning them upside down. Kant had declared, that there must be a god, because his existence could not be proven by means of the things which were in this world of human perceptions. Hegel, on the contrary declared, that there must be a god, because the things of this world had a real existence, and because the Absolute Idea alone was

And the theologians, on their part, had furnished a third proof for the existence of a god by declaring that he must be there, because the world exists in reality. In short, the human mind, in spite of all scientific progress, was still groping around blindly in the same old contradictory circle. But this maze of contradictions was heralded by the ruling class as the most sublime wisdom, and disseminated by the leaders of thought with the zeal of fanatics. If any proletarian thinker attempted to establish the truth of his theories by such methods, he would be considered a fit companion for the inmates of a lunatic asylum. The most unreal and phantastic ideas were hailed as inspired, and the simplest matter of fact truths assailed as hair-brained imaginations. The classic German school after Hegel, represented by men like Schelling, Fichte, and Schopenhauer, never got out of this labyrinth.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

(To be Continued.)

The American Marseillaise.

Ye sons of liberty, defenders
Of freedom and of deathless Right,
Again the Lord of sabaoth tenders
The flaming sword and bids you fight.
Behold the poor, and hear their cries!
Behold the poor, and hear their cries!
Shall usurers bind our babes in fetters
Which keep the landless life-long slaves,
And even grudge us room for graves?
Shall workers be perpetual debtors?
Unite, ye hosts of toil,
Unite to live or die;
Strike down the hands that now despoil,
Strike, all, for victory.

Here, here where Liberty first lightened
And freedom spoken shook the world,
Where hope for all the humble brightened
And mightiest kings were backward hurled
Lo here, where equal rights are pledged,
Lo here, where equal rights are pledged,
Are kings with all their brood of curses!
In this broad land, by blood made free,
Dependent millions bend the knee
And plead with tears for sovran mercies!
Unite, ye hosts, etc.

With "vested rights!" flung in our faces
They trample down the people's will!
They crowd the millions from their places,
And call on hireling hordes to kill!
Above the earth they sit enthroned!
Above the earth they sit enthroned!
And sweep their realm with hunger scourges!
They drive the poor from Nature's stores;
For greater gain they lock the doors,
And dare the crowd that round them surges!
Unite, ye hosts, etc.

They claim the ways which commerce uses,
As bold highwaymen robbing all;
They grasp exchange, and each refuses
Its use till all before him fall.

The people now are ruled by gold,
By landlords, trusts and bankers' gold!

But shall we here be made the minions
Of kings on freedom's sacred soil;
Or earn them wealth by slavish toil,

And meekly wear their galling pinions?
Unite, ye hosts, etc.

Once more, once more are heroes waking,

As dawns a righteous day foretold,
And marching forth their cry is shaking

The hideous shapes of evils old;
By all, for all, our laws shall be!
By all, for all, our laws shall be!

The forming hosts of honest labor
Shall give to each his place, his part,
His manhood worth in every mart,

And neighbor live at peace with neighbor.

Unite, ye hosts, etc.

Chicago.

GEORGE HOWARD GIBSON.

The Glorification of Work.

THE industrial development of the nineteenth century imprints itself on every social phenomenon. The nearer the completion of the structure of capitalism the greater is its influence felt in all social phenomena and in its final development it must determine humanity's entire thought and action.

In its first manifestation capitalism encountered both anger and scorn. The first great social result of the growth of capitalism was the *French Revolution*, for in the last analysis, the Revolution was but the struggle of the middle class for the establishment of a free competitive wage-system. Afterwards in England *Chartism and Trade-Unionism* began to struggle against the new form of a developing capitalism. The great economic changes as the result of increasing use of machinery transformed the thought of the times. Scientific researches were made concerning the new methods of production and especially regarding its social effects. *Fourier, Saint-Simon and Comte*, in France, and *Robert Owen* in England keenly analyzed the societies of the past and present and speculated on the society of the future. Fourier and Owen tried to realize their ideas in practice. Owen's Society of the Pioneers of Rochdale was born. But as the economic movements of the time were themselves slow and hesitating in aims and means so these Utopian dreams could give no key to the correct recognition of society.

But capitalism grew apace. *Engels* published his "Condition of the Working Classes in England in 1844" and founded the modern method of social scientific investigation. Soon afterward the "Communist Manifesto" appeared the joint work of *Marx and Engels* and it was the first expression of the workingmen's mission.

Capitalism grows and revolutions sweep the outgrown feudal systems of Europe. Capitalism grows and writers feel its poisonous breath. *Turgenev, Dostojewski, Hauptmann, Ibsen, Bjornson, Zola and Walt Whitman* showed in their writings how they were influenced more and more by the destructiveness of capitalism and how they were driven, involuntarily perhaps, to revolt; they open up the great flood of modern radical literature. But they stumbled for they were not guided by a great all-embracing principle; a great philosophy was not yet known to them by means of which the individual and social problem was to be solved.

Capitalism grows. It breaks into the family and destroys it;

it transforms homes, changes the site of cities and makes new landscapes, creates entirely new classes, it even alters men's faces and the expression of women and children. And the artists, yielding so easily to impressions, begin to embody the new martyrdom of man. *Antoine Wiertz* pictured the crimes of society, the destruction of disease and war. *Charles de Groux* especially became the delineator of human suffering; his "Drunkard" pictures with terrifying reality the misery of family life. Then *Leon Frederic* described, in his "Chalk-Miners," with overwhelming earnestness the vicious circle of misery: in the morning the family go, tired and silently, to work; at noon, tired and silently, they sit down to their dinner of rotten potatoes, and in the evening they return, tired and silently, to the city. Then *Steinlen* descended into the slums of Paris and brought to the light innumerable varieties of depravity and degradation.

Capitalism grows. It corrupts politics, prostitutes universities, churches and schools, enslaves art and literature, poisons the life in its simplest manifestation. Finally there was a revolt and a challenge to the destructiveness of capitalism, the working class organized for resistance. Socialism was born. When capitalism became an international institution the small and hesitating movements of men and their indefinite thoughts coalesced into one great movement holding the same great ideal.

Socialism grows. The classics of socialist science and literature appear. The socialist movement gains in political and economic influence. And soon the new view-point, the world aspect, the philosophy of solidarity, became practically and scientifically a fact. And man was born anew. MAN the socialist, the harbinger of society's economic and ethical development.

Socialism grows. The rotation begins anew, but *reversed*. First capitalism transformed society and produced socialism; now, socialism is transforming society and exterminating capitalism. Social institutions, man, art, literature, everything is being transformed co-incidentally with the increasing political and economical influence of socialism. Man has realized that not only the economic problem but all ideals and sentiments find their solution in socialism. Involuntarily so, because it is a natural law; and voluntarily so in so far as we perceive that it is a natural law and work with it rather than resist it.

In the socialist we recognize the germ of a new human type. We see a new world in process of development: the socialist society. The socialist is not only a man, he is a fellowman! And his manner of association with his fellowman of to-day permits us to forecast the future society. His feeling of solidarity and his wish to live a harmonious life are constantly gaining in importance as social factors until finally they become the essential factors in the evolution of society.

Entire classes of men are penetrated by these germs of evolution; consequently they are forced to express and manifest them. The great principle of human solidarity begins to work. University professors preach the truth of socialism: Ferri, Menger, Sombart, York Powell and many others. Inventors, like Tesla, hold before men's eyes the future happiness of mankind. Artists no longer desire to picture the sufferings of mankind, but try to construct the future of society based upon the socialist movement and the future man from the type of the socialist. They find constructive elements in the socialist movement, which are far more inspiring than the destructive capitalistic forces. Not the fall of man but the revival of man has become the center of their interest.

Zola himself has gone through this development. *L'Assomoir*, *Germinal*, *Travail*, *The Working of the Evils of Society*, *The Germination of a New Society*; *The New Society*, are keystones in his own as well as in society's development. Here, a practical man, a Hyndman receives an inspiration from the socialist movement; there, an artistic soul of a William Morris, a Walter Crane and an Oscar Wilde become spiritualized by the great ethical and esthetic possibilities of Socialism. Anatole France—undoubtedly the greatest writer to-day in France—draws the elixir of his life and work from the blossoming beauty of socialist action and thought.

Thus we realize involuntarily the emptiness of the saying: "*L'Art pour L'Art*." Because we now cannot help but see that society is an organism consisting of interdependent cells and the moment a cell separates itself from the social organism it must perish. There are not, there can not be, living isolated cells; there are no isolated social entities. Every cell is the supporter of every other cell and all support each other. Everything and everybody is a means to life and further development of itself and of all society. Art can not be but such a means. It is impossible to imagine art as an independent cell, nourishing itself from itself, as a private passion of an artist. The artist, as well as his art, is a product of society, therefore both are bound psychologically to serve society. Art never existed for Art's sake alone, but has always supported the desire and ideals of its age; supported and expressed them—positively or negatively—by means of the highest form possible.

The greatness of art lies in its capacity to see things more embracingly, to recognize beauties lying beyond the grasp of the average beholder and to compel him to see and enjoy the beauties it discovered. A great artist is, and will always be, one who expresses with the most far-sighted vision the characteristics of his age, those characteristics, of course, which are of eternal value either in beauty or power or in both. Art for Art's sake is the phrase of the false artist who does not feel and understand the

forces of his time and who can produce but monotonous "figures" or "sweet" happenings. His art is dead. The true artist feels, and understands the social forces and sees their future development and he tries to enlarge and beautify them in his soul. His inspiration is unlimited. His vision, strengthened and intoxicated with living issues, draws him to original and perhaps to eternal creation. For anything which moved mankind and lived with it is eternally engraved in its life.

This then is the attitude of great artists and writers toward social forces and social life. To have a true conception of social forces—to enlarge the same in their own spiritual life—and finally to express the matured thought in an artistic form, for the sake of beauty. This is their function. The artist's imagination, his force, his sense of beauty, his cleverness has an unlimited field for development, but only this psychological transformation—the conception of social forces—gives him a real basis for artistic creation. Art can only realize its task—the beautifying of life—when it rests upon this ground—and then it may give to man those new ideas and forces of beauty which, with its far-reaching sense, it realizes to be innate in man's soul.

The development of *Constantin Meunier*, who undoubtedly was the greatest sculptor of our time, proves very clearly the influence of social changes on an artist's soul. Meunier was born in a suburb of Brussels in 1837. His parents and all his family were very poor. He showed at a very early age an intense feeling for art and as a boy he went to Brussels to the Academy where he copied with great enthusiasm from the antique. But he soon realized the unprofitable nature of this and he saw that he could never thus accomplish great and original work when led by the dead ideal of a past age. The conventional spirit and aimless admiration of the antique no longer could satisfy him for they did not represent the living beauty of the life of his own day. Impelled by a melancholy temperament and influenced by his poverty and the misery of his environment, he followed his friend De Groux and depicted scenes of suffering and sadness. He began with religious pictures, but the spirit of the Time conquered him and his art was saved.

The smoke of factories, the roar and throb of machinery, the mining of coal, the workingmen's dangers, the miner's risk, the incessant work of the farmer, the monumentality of the dock-laborers' work—all, all appealed to his senses and moulded his soul. He began to feel the struggle of the workingman and finally devoted all his art to depict this struggle. His strong pastels prove how magnificently he identified himself with the spirit of the working masses.

But Meunier's eyes were opened. He saw that suffering and heroic risk are not the only characteristics of the working-

men. He realized that suffering even made them stronger by compelling them to unite with their fellow-workers and he saw that this union produced a higher moral consciousness and elevated their ethical standard. It was a revelation to Meunier; the tendencies of his time and those of the future were now clear to him. From the close and dark air of the factory and mine was unfolded to him the magnificent strength and social consciousness of the workingman.

The metamorphosis of Meunier was completed. First he was an "*L'Art pour L'Art's*" adherent, monotonously copying, then the painter and sculptor of the "Poor-People," picturing the hopeless tragedy of their lives, and finally he became conscious of the reconstructive social and individual forces and embodied them in the powerful form of the self-conscious workingman.

Among the products of this last influence is his "*Miner*," a young, strong man, swinging a hammer. The tremendous blow which he is directing is keenly expressed in his whole body and face. The strength applied to swing his body is concentrated in his muscular back. His feet, his shoulders, his neck, his eyes, all, participate in the blow. Labor is here represented in the same sense as the noblest gymnastic by the ancient masters; as the only preserver of human strength and vigor.

His "*Reaper*" is the modern Gladiator. His strength makes his work but a trifle for him to cope with. He defiantly surveys the broad field with his sharp eyes!

His "*Dock-Laborer*" is a strong, proud worker. He stands upright, at rest. His hands are resting on his hips. His face is dignified. His attitude reflects the consciousness of strength, that magnificent strength which is increased by repose, which makes him able to carry the heaviest load on his iron shoulders, as a feather. Consciousness, proud self-consciousness, is in this labor giant.

Whether Meunier pictures the miner, the farmer or the fisherman he always glorifies strength and consciousness. Like the keystone of his activity is his unfinished monument, "*The Glorification of Labor*." The four sides of the colossal foundation will be ornamented with bas-relief, each representing a different manifestation of industry.

At the four corners of the base are four figures, one of which, "*The Maternity*," is the great Saint-Image of modern times: a mother with her two boys. "*The Reapers*," one of the four reliefs, represents agriculture. Oppressive heat prevails. The glowing sunbeams fall directly on the reapers. Four figures, cutting, proceed the others. Following are men and women, binding the sheaves. Near to them an ox is eating the fresh grain. Simplicity and earnestness dominate the whole. Never hitherto in

sculpture has such work and motion, such air and force, such sun and heat been expressed.

The magnificent statue, the symbolic figure of the "Sower" sprinkling the "fructifying seeds," which stands on the base and looks at us majestically, represents the unlimited power which is the result of the co-operation of work and force, of nature and man.

In the works of *Jean Francois Millet* the fragrant and smiling spring, clad in luxurious colors, intoxicates the worker. The fertile earth, overflowing with force, overwhelms him. The characteristic of Millet is: "*Le cri de la Terre*"—"The Cry of the Earth." The superiority of the earth and nature over man. The work of man does not harmonize with the work of nature. The earth is the commanding power. Man must obey, he must surrender to this power.

"*The cry of force*," "*The Voice of Consciousness*," is the master spirit in Meunier's work. Man and nature are not subordinated but co-ordinated to each other. They are harmonizing and co-operative forces. The wonderful touch of nature makes man a higher being, conscious of his faculties. Nature and work do not overpower him, but elevate him and multiply his forces and abilities, set a broader scope to his work and show him that his force and labor is just as creative a power as is nature itself.

Thus Meunier expresses his philosophy, which recognizes in force and work the animating and supporting elements of society. He discarded the old way of attracting people's interest; the agitator's voice, speaking from the pictures of the "poor-people," disappeared. Cheap inartistic effects were avoided and the eternal truth brought forth by purely artistic forms, by the rhythm of beauty found when force and action work consciously with man. The beauty of Meunier's art is in its originality and sublime simplicity; his art is unlimited, is eternal because it embraces the eternal verities.

Meunier died in March, 1905, accompanied by the love and sorrow of all who love art and all who love a noble man and who struggle for the salvation of mankind.

At the grave his friend *Stacquet* said: "*We loved you, Meunier, for your glorious eyes, which were full of goodness; we loved you for your great heart, which was full of sympathy; we loved you, Meunier, for your fine hands, which were full of service. Farewell, Meunier, farewell, my poor Meunier!*"

ODON POR.

The Political Side of Economics.

POLITICS and Economics are the obverse and reverse sides of industrial life. Conflicting material interests are the basis of social strife. Political parties are the expression of conflicting economic interests. The importance and fervidness of political campaigns are in direct ratio to the magnitude of the material interests involved. Political parties sometimes represent interests within interests, and these subordinate interests are represented by "Political Reform" parties.

The economic interests represented by the different political parties when understood by the voters, enable the latter to deposit their ballots for the candidates of such parties as represent their own particular interests.

Socialists address their propaganda of principles to the working class, primarily, because Socialism is the political expression of the interests of the exploited working class. It is the labor of the workers, combined with the multiplied factors of modern civilization in the machinery of production, that produces from the bosom of Mother Earth all the wealth of the world. The wealth thus produced is appropriated by the few through the wage system, with its corollaries of Rent, Interest and Profit.

Socialists point out that these are the respectable and legal methods by which Labor is despoiled of its product. Legal, because the class that now owns the means of production and distribution of the things necessary to human life also own the law making powers and control the courts; laws are *always* made and administered *in the interest of the owning class*: respectable, because the morals of each epoch in history serve only to reflect the economic interests of the master class in that epoch.

The only consideration the working class enjoys at the hands of the dominant class in society today is that its members shall be permitted to retain of the product of their toil sufficient for mere subsistence, and this only because of the necessity to perpetuate their kind. This is what is known as "The iron law of wages."

The present capitalist class having obtained possession of the means of wealth production, and its tenure thereto strengthened by the laws of the capitalist regime, and the capitalist class

being comparatively few numerically, the only commodity left to the worker that he can sell in order to have access to the means of wealth production, and which access thereto he *must have* in order to live, is his *laboring power*. In exchange for his laboring power, which he surrenders unconditionally to the owning class, he is given wages. Wages represents only a part of the product of his toil; the other part the owner keeps and calls "Profit." The worker is under the absolute necessity of thus selling himself, because he has no other means of making a living, and is thus constituted a slave—a "wage slave."

Profit, or the surplus product of the workers' toil appropriated by the capitalist owner, is the unpaid wages of labor, and is that of which the worker is *robbed*. The capitalists, the robber class, utilize the wealth thus unjustly filched from the workers by re-investment in dividend drawing stocks and bonds representing additional ownership in the means of life—land, mills, factories, railroads, etc., from which interest is yielded, and rent, enabling them to live in idleness as social parasites—the tramps' apotheosis.

The working class being numerically greater than the number required for the operation of the means of production under the methods of present social order, a vast number of the workers are left deprived of the means of obtaining employment—are deprived of even the poor privilege of being wage slaves. These are called "Capital's Reserve Army of the Unemployed."

Laboring power being a commodity, and as such subject to the laws of trade under capitalist society, the price of labor is forced down by competition between the laborers to the point where actual subsistence only may be maintained. If discontent arises among the slaves who are fortunate enough to have employment and a strike for "higher wages," that is to say a larger part of their product than their owners allow them, Capital's reserve army of the unemployed are available by the tens of thousands to be put in the places of their discontented fellow workers. In the face of these conditions the unions of the A. F. of L. type are utterly powerless.

The axiomatic basis of socialist philosophy is that in every age the institutions of society must conform to the prevailing methods of production. This is what is known as the philosophy of Material Determinism. The simple tools of our forbears have developed into complex machines driven by steam and electricity. In this age humanity is essentially interdependent. Machinery has specialized the labor of the working class. Labor, formerly functioning in the individual through the simple tool of produc-

tion, now functions in the collectivity through the complexity of that tool developed into the machine, and wealth, from an individual product, has become the product of the collectivity—a social product.

In the days when the simple tool was owned by the individual worker the product was his, and he enjoyed a measure of economic freedom. There was comparatively little industrial friction, and "competition" was "the life of trade." In this age the tool, which is now the complex machine of socialized productivity, has passed out of the possession of the class that uses it and into the possession of the class who do not use it; and here is where the conflict of interest centers between the working class and the owning class.

This antagonism and the resultant conflict is called "The Class Struggle," and this struggle is destined to grow in intensity until the ownership of the tools of production is restored to the class that uses them. This change of ownership will restore harmony in the relations of human society, and it is necessary in order that the integrity of the human race may be preserved and its progressive development insured.

The working class dispossessed of the means of life in the machinery of production are known as the expropriated proletariat. Into this class the present middle class of society is rapidly being forced by the same laws that operated to dispossess the former owners of the simpler tools and the resources of life. The fate of the "middle class" is as absolutely certain as the inherence of cosmic law in the order of the universe.

The Socialist political movement of the working class recognizes the interest of every worker in the world as being essentially identical with the interest of every other worker, irrespective of race, color or nationality, and the united interests of the workers are opposed at every point to the interests of those who have constituted themselves the guardians of the present social order, hence all political parties not committed to the Socialist Program.

There being no common ground of agreement between Capitalism and Socialism, the interests of each being diametrically opposed, the socialist political movement takes its stand on the platform of the class struggle, and its mission is to educate the working class to an understanding of the identity of their interests, and to solidarity of action at the ballot box, for the overthrow of the existing social order by the capture of the powers of government. The governmental powers once seized they shall be utilized to replace the present quasi-political system of capitalist institutionalism by an industrial regime in which the machinery of production will become the collective property of the people, and wealth will be produced under a sane and

sensible system without waste and for the use of the people willing to render each his or her quota of social service, and there shall be no such thing as profit in such industry.

In this, then, the Socialist Republic, the hour of service rendered will be used as the measure of value in the exchange of products; machinery will be used to lighten toil and shorten the hours of labors for ALL the workers instead of intensifying the labor and consuming the vitality of the few for a wage pittance as is now done; the army of the unemployed will then have disappeared; the hopeless struggle for existence that obtains under the existing system will have ceased, and there will be guaranteed TO EVERY HUMAN BEING the right to life, liberty and the realization of all the happiness that the most favorable economic conditions can afford.

WORD H. MILLS.

Dallas, Texas, March 16, 1905.

I. Socialist and Socialism.

THE words socialist and socialism were introduced into economic discussion by L. Reybaud, in 1840, in his *'Etudes sur les Reformateurs ou Socialistes Modernes.'*¹ " This was the opinion of the eminent authority on socialism, Dr. Richard T. Ely, expressed in his French and German Socialism in Modern Times, written in 1883, and for twenty years the statement has been quoted in cyclopedias, dictionaries and treatises upon socialism as authoritative and final.²

Since these words were in use much earlier than 1840, we have here an interesting illustration of how an error perpetuates itself. And an error of this character is quite pardonable when no controversy sharpens the critical sense of readers and recruits the labor and energy of an army of inquiring minds to ransack all conceivable places for information—each spurred by curiosity, the zeal of first discovery, or the joy of refutation. Consider the magnitude, and for any one man the impossibility, of ascertaining the very first printed use of the word "horse" in English, spelled in this manner, for instance; the hundreds of thousands of pages that must be turned, the millions of words the eye must scrutinize. Hence it is wholly legitimate to rely upon current opinion rather than to indulge in laborious research to fix upon the initial publication date of a word of even very modern origin. In these days the horizon of serviceable inquiry is so far-spread that no qualified thinker can excuse himself in the waste of the fleeting hours of a short life over non-essentials.

However, with socialism looming large in the world's thought, growing in Germany, a political force in France; with socialist parties yearly growing in importance in the United States; with margin-ideas, such as municipal ownership, questions of widespread discussion and dispute; with the prophecy of the late Senator Hanna still ringing in our ears that the next great American political struggle would be over socialism—for all these reasons, the earliest uses of the term are of historical

¹ Ely, French and German Socialism, p. 29 note.

² Century Dictionary, art. "Socialism."

"To this industrial order the term Socialism was first applied by Reybaud, a French writer, in 1839. The word, however, originated in England a few years earlier in connection with the Owen Movement." Sprague, Socialism from Genesis to Revelation, (Boston, 1893), p. 3.

interest and not without value in viewing the evolution of industrial society.

Quite naturally, the insistent assertion of L. Reybaud that he originated the term socialism has been widely accepted.⁸ Reybaud, however, clearly admits the currency of these words at least in England at the time he "coined" the new term in his book.⁹ The first edition of his "Studies of the Reformers" was published in 1840, probably composed during the year 1839.

Other writers have been quite sure that to Pierre Leroux belongs the honor of having coined the terms somewhere about the year 1832.¹⁰

As late as 1848 the term socialism, however, was little known in France, as indicated by an incident related of Proudhon: "After the Days of June in 1848, Proudhon said to the magistrate who examined him, that he went to contemplate 'the sublime horrors of the cannonade.' 'But,' said the magistrate, 'are you a socialist.' 'Certainly.' 'Well, but what, then, is Socialism.'"

A large number of writers also credit Robert Owen with

⁸ "Les illusions de ce genre sont devenues si contagieuses, si generales de notre temps, qu'elles ont merite les honneurs d'un nom nouveau et desormais consacrer: c'est celui de socialisme en autres l'art d'improviser des societes irreprochables." (Reybaud, *Etudes*, etc., 2nd ed. 1848. 1st ed. pub. in 1840.)

⁹ "L. Reybaud a en 1864 (Pref. de la 7e ed. des *Reformateurs* reclame la priorite.) V. aussi Socialisme, dans l'ancien Dictionn. de l'econ. politique." Note p. 1, Socialisme, Communisme et Collectivisme, par Eugene d'Eichthal, Paris, 1892.

¹⁰ Robert Owen, presented to the Queen in January 1846, and as a result "Leveque d'Exeter se fit remarquer par une sortie fouqueuse contre le chef des socialistes." Notes in Reybaud, p. 402.

¹¹ Socialism of the modern type began in 1817, the year when Robert Owen laid before Parliament his plan for a socialistic community. Is first used in connection with the later agitation of Robert Owen from 1830-1840; and first popularized by Reybaud (1840)." Bliss Cyc. of Social Reform, art. "Socialism."

¹² The term was soon afterwards borrowed by a distinguished French writer, Reybaud, in his well known work, *The Reformateurs Modernes*, in which he discovered the theories of St. Simon, Fourier and Owen. Through Reybaud it soon gained wide currency on the continent and is now the accepted historic name for one of the most remarkable movements of the 19th Century." Kirkup, *History of Socialisme*, 1892.

¹³ "The term, applied in its modern sense, was first used by Reybaud, a French writer, originated in England a few years earlier in connection with the Owen Movement." Sprague, F. M., supra.

¹⁴ "Il fut cree en 1833 par Pierre Leroux." L. Reybaud — adopta immediately a ne ologisme de Pierre Leroux." Malon, *Histoire du Socialisme*.

¹⁵ The term socialism, as opposed to individualism, was coined by Pierre Leroux, in 1833 (cf. *La Grande Cyclopedie*) which was adopted by Reybaud in 1840. All seem to agree. Dict. Pol. Econ.

¹⁶ "Celui-ci pretend avoir le premier 'forge' le mot en France vers 1833 (V. *La Greve de Samarez*, 1863, p. 255 et 365) mais il ne donne pas d'indication precise." Eichthal, supra, p. 1 note.

¹⁷ "Le mot Socialisme a ete employe pour la premiere fois en 1832 par Pierre Leroux, d'une maniere vague, comme oppose individualisme; Owen en 1835 employe d'une maniere plus precise pour designer la transformation communiste de l'organisation economique dans l'interet des travailleurs." *La Grande Encyclopedie*, v. 30 p. 119.

¹⁸ Das Wort Socialismus stammt von Pierre Leroux, der, wie er sagte, das Wort schmiedete in Opposition gegen den Individualismus" u. a. w. *Handbuch des Socialismus* p. 752, (Zurich, 1897).

¹⁹ Woolsey, T. D., *Communism and Socialism*, 1886.

the introduction of the words into literature and language—though with great variety in the specification of the dates.^{14 15 16}

Certain it is, however, some of the Owenites called themselves "socialists" during the years 1835-36,¹⁷ and both socialist and socialism are used without quotation marks, indicating the acceptance of the terms at least within the cult of the Owen Movement. In June 1835 a Mr. Henderson began his address to an assemblage with the words: "Friends and Socialists."¹⁸

In the "Comrade" for March, 1903, however, Mr. John Spargo points out probably the first published use of the term socialist, under the date of August 24, 1833, as follows:

"It is to Robert Owen that the imperishable honor of having 'coined' these words (socialism and socialist) is by common consent ascribed; but, singularly enough, although all the contemporaries acknowledged him as the author of the words, and he himself, I believe, claimed the honor, the first instance on record of the use of the word in print is by an unknown writer. In 1831 Henry Hetherington, the well known English Pioneer Chartist, in his fight for a free 'unstamped' press, began the publication of a paper called 'The Poor Man's Guardian,' a 'Weekly Paper, for the People, published in defiance of Law, to Try the Power of Might against Right,' and in this paper on the 24th of August, 1833, appeared a letter signed 'A Socialist.' No earlier instance of the word has, I believe, ever been found. The phraseology of this letter is that of the early Owen agitation and it is quite evident that its author used the word Socialist as a synonym for 'Owenite,' the name popularly given to Robert Owen's followers. The general opinion is that the new word had been used and to some extent popularized by Owen in his propaganda before this appearance of it in print."¹⁹

¹⁴ "Le mot socialisme, employé d'abord en Angleterre dans les publications des disciples de Robert Owen. — A l'occasion de la fondation sous les auspices d'Owen de 'The Association of all classes of all nations.' (1835) v. Encyc. Britt., art. 'Socialism.' Eichthal p. 1 supra.

¹⁵ "The term Socialism was first used at a public meeting, May 1, 1835, at which time the Association of all Classes of all Nations was formed. The members came to be known as Socialists." Holyoke History of Cooperation VI. p. 210.

¹⁶ "A specimen of the manner in which what was called Socialism of the day was combatted was published at that time as having been sung at St. Phillip's Sunday School Salford on Whit Monday May 23, 1831." Jones. L., The Life, Times and Labours of Robert Owen, London, 1890.

¹⁷ "The word is of comparatively recent origin having been coined in England in 1835." — "Robert Owen founded the Socialist Association of All Nations." Reybaud, in *Reformateurs Modernes*, 1839. It is interesting to note that it has been claimed that it was first used in 1846 by Reybaud in his *Etudes*. (Encyc. Britt.) This shows the lack of a definite idea of the word as early as 1846.

¹⁸ We announce that 5001 have been sent — to being a school for the children of Socialists. *New Moral World*, Mar. 31, 1835, No. 180. Also see *ib.*, Mar. 12, 1836, p. 163; April 16, p. 196; May 21, p. 240; June 11, p. 264; July 2, p. 288 (When SOCIALIST shall have left off imputing unworthy to his friends," etc.

"Notices" to Correspondence etc.)

¹⁹ *New Moral World Saturday*, June 27, 1835, p. 273.

²⁰ "Socialism and Social Democracy: the Origin of our Names," in 'The Comrade,' V. 2, No. 6, p. 135, March 1903; see 'The Poor Man's Guardian,' No. 116, Saturday, August 24, 1833 p. 275. 'Library: Univ. of Wis. Ju. 45. p. 79.)

It is a curious coincidence that after thus finding what may well be the original article in which the term "Socialist" is launched, investigation is baffled by the impossibility of identifying the anonymous writer. At any rate diligent scrutiny of the voluminous literature of the Owenite Movement reaching back to 1817 has so far failed to reveal an earlier use of the term.

The French State Socialist, Louis Blanc, who became one of the editors of "Le Bon Sens," in 1835, at the age of twenty-one,²¹ may have made an earlier use of the term, but that he actually did is not regarded as probable.²² To the unknown enthusiast, therefore, for the present at least, we must credit the origin of the term "Socialist" and out of it, "Socialism."

II. COMMUNIST AND COMMUNISM.

The term Communism (Fr. *Communisme* from *commun*, common, from Latin *communis*, common) is currently believed to be a much older term than Socialism. "Socialism, should be sharply distinguished from Communism, which is an older term."²³ It would be somewhat surprising if this were not the case. "All historical nations, so far as known, at one time held their land in common, the individual having only the use of a portion of it for a certain period. A survival still exists in the Russian Mir."²⁴ The agitation to found a new social order upon some communistic basis reaches as far back into history as Plato—back, it might perhaps be said, to the time when humanity first emerged from the communism of the patriarchal group.²⁵

Careful search through the publications of St. Simon, who died in 1825, and through the early communistic writers in England, such as Owen, may yet reveal an early use of the term. Indeed, it seems very probable that some more generic term than "St. Simonian Family" would have been applied by publicists discussing the movement, at least as the movement came into such wide public notice in France in 1830-32.^{26 27}

²¹ Ely *supra* p. 151.

²² Sprague, *supra* p. 151.

²³ *Ib.*, p. 3.

²⁴ New Int. Cyc. vol. V, p. 87.

²⁵ "We certainly want a true history of socialism, meaning by that a history of every systematic attempt to provide a new social existence for the mass of the workers," Harrison, new social existence for the mass of the workers. Harrison, F., quoted in Webster's Dictionary, art. 'Socialism.' "

²⁶ After his (St. Simon's) death his disciples formed an association called the St. Simonian family, which after the revolution of 1830, rose rapidly into notoriety and favor. With the notions common to many other social reformers the members of this association united the doctrine that the division of goods be "according to proportion, etc." Practical difficulties arose in carrying the scheme into execution, and, in 1832, the Association was dispersed by the French Government. Worcester's Dict., (1832) art. "Socialism."

²⁷ Professor Commons of the University of Wisconsin is authority for the statement that the word "agrarianism" was the term applied during the early part of the 19th century to advocates of socialism and communism.

The same expectation of a general descriptive term might be sought for in the early discussions of and about Robert Owen, "who founded the abortive experimental communities of Orbiston in Lanarkshire (1823)," etc.²⁵ What did Owen himself call these communities? In 1829 in public discussions he refers to "communities" but makes no use of the term "communism."²⁶ As late as 1836, Owen still used, and somewhat cumbrously, the word "community" where had the word "communism" been in his vocabulary it would certain seem that he would have used it. For instance, he says: "It is my intention to stay at Birmingham — — and if we are only in good earnest about the matter, they must think, and cannot help it, that we mean what we say, and are determined of attaining our object — Community."²⁷

Not until 1840 have the present investigators found usage of the terms communist and communism. M. Reybaud in his *Studies of the Reformers* mentions communism as a term used by Pierre Leroux,²⁸ and of communists as a term then well understood.

Louis Blanc, in his *Organization of Labor* (*L'Organisation du Travail*) 1839, favored a communistic state, but that he used the specific terms has not been ascertained.²⁹

Pierre Joseph Proudhon, in his first *Memoir on Property*,³⁰ uses the term communism in expression of his opinions. "We give them in English in Mr. Benj. R. Ticker's translation: p. 259, 'I ought not conceal the fact that property and communism,' etc., p. 261, 'Communism is inequality, but not as property is.'"³¹ A writer in 1848 says he conversed with Frenchmen in 1840, and then first pronounced the word communism.³² At the time of the Corn Laws agitation in England the following appeared, which illustrates the apparent absence of clear ideas regarding the terms at that period: "What is a communist? One who hath yearnings for equal division of unequal earnings. Idler or bungler, or both, he is willing to fork out his penny and pocket your shilling."³³ But in 1843 works on communists and communism were already on the market.³⁴ By 1850 a *History of Communism* had appeared.³⁵

²⁵ *Globe. Encyc.*, V. 2, p. 213.

²⁶ Owen's *View of Public Discussion*, 1829, p. 230.

²⁷ *New Moral World*, Saturday, May 7, 1836, p. 220.

²⁸ "M. Pierre Leroux — — pretend qu'après le communisme se réalisera la vraie doctrine de l'égalité," etc. *Etudes supra*, p. 133; "Nos Communistes français constituent une variété de cette nombreuse famille." *Ib.* vol. 2, p. 111.

²⁹ See Murray's *New English Dictionary*, art. "Communism."

³⁰ Son *mémoire "Qu'est-ce que la propriété?"* mark en 1840 son début dans cette science nouvelle. (*La Grande Cyc.*, art. "Proudhon.")

³¹ Woolsey, *supra*, p. 11.

³² Goodwyn Barmby in *The Apostle*, No. 1, 1848. (See Murray's *New Eng. Dict.*)

³³ *Cyc. Britt.*, VI, p. 211.

³⁴ *The New Age*, May 24, 1843. (Murray's *Dict.*, art. "Communism.")

³⁵ See A. Sudre, *Histoire du Communisme*, 1850. Cited by B. Malon, 1883. Also Fleury: *Babeuf et le Socialisme en 1796*, 1851.

Mr. J. M. Ludlow, in his "Christian Socialism," published in 1851, attempted to distinguish socialism and communism. He said: "Communism starts from *thing* and is in essential antagonistic to property. Socialism starts from *person* and is in essential antagonistic to human discord and rivalry." "

III. CONCLUSION.

The present investigation, subject to further research in foreign publications and libraries and unexpected discoveries in obscure places and publications not heretofore cited by writers on social reform, credits the first published use of the terms 'Socialism' and 'Socialist,' 'Communism,' and 'Communist,' as follows:

I. Socialist and Socialism:

1833. Anonymous Writer, in the Poor Man's Guardian.

II. Communist and Communism:

1840. Reybaud, in his Etudes sur les Reformateurs.

University of Wisconsin.

J. E. BAKER. H. M. HIGDAY. D. E. MOWRY.

" Century Dictionary, art. "Socialism."

EDITORIAL

The Wisconsin Situation.

The article which we publish elsewhere in this issue from Comrade Thompson is a very good sample of the sort of stuff that has made Wisconsin so many enemies. We cull the following choice gems of language as showing his style of argument. His critics "tear their hair and get red in the face," indulge in "carping criticism" and "tirades" or are "American pigmies," "fools," "careless, lazy and indifferent" "doctrinaire and shallow-minded" or are inspired either by "effrontery or stupidity," "intellectual cowardice" or "weakness of youth." When such language as this is constantly used we need not be surprised that the whole Wisconsin situation is being confused by the desire on the part of a great many comrades to "get even" for the insulting abuse that has been poured forth from Milwaukee.

Considering the article on its merits we are struck in the first place with its extremely conceited attitude and mis-statements. We wonder if Wisconsin conceit has quite reached the point where its socialists really believe that they were the first to adopt a municipal platform with immediate demands, or to attempt to discuss the farmer question. It will also be news to thousands of socialists throughout the country, who have never noticed that Milwaukee had a platform, that they are all now engaged in copying that document.

As a fine example of dodging the question Comrade Thompson's article stands in the first rank. His attempt to confuse the present question with a mass of entirely irrelevant stuff seems to indicate that he was conscious of the weakness of the real position under consideration.

His statement that Comrade Berger's action "has been no violation either of the state or national platforms or constitution" is rather naive to say the least. The very condition of membership set forth in the national constitution requires that the party should be made up only of those who have "severed connections with all other political parties." If voting for any political party is not maintaining a connection with it, what is?

And if it is not "compromising with any other party" to advise its support, then what does constitute such compromise?

Yet in spite of all these facts, in spite of the would-be defenders of Wisconsin, which should cause the socialist movement of that state to pray to be delivered from its friends, we have still opposed and shall oppose to the best of our ability any action which will tend to disrupt that organization and shall insist that the action of comrades outside the state should be confined to criticism.

We feel perfectly sure that the present action will never be repeated in spite of the bravado which has been manifested. We know that there has arisen an opposition within the state against such tactics, sufficiently strong to make their repetition dangerous. We believe that it is safe to trust to this internal opposition. We are even optimistic enough to believe that Wisconsin may be sometime educated up to the point where it will not only oppose the tactics that have been disapproved, but it may even be able to conduct a newspaper and a controversy without language that smells of the gutter.

There is just one phase of the argument that has been continually pushed forward by Milwaukee in this connection that is worth attention. This is the statement that they are only following foreign precedents. In one sense of the word that is true. There is probably no Socialist Party in Europe in which a man would be censured for doing what Comrade Berger has just done, and this may well be offered by him as a reason for arguing for such a policy. But it may easily be responded to such an argument that all the reasons which are urged in Europe in support of such action, and which tend to justify it, are absent in America. In no other country in the world are there but two classes struggling for a mastery. In every European country there are still remnants of Feudalism which tend to confuse the lines of the class struggle. Almost every political condition which is used to justify such action in Europe is also absent in America. We have no second elections; we do have universal suffrage and direct representation. Under these conditions it would seem to indicate a rather perverted idea of Marxism to offer the European excuse.

But this question has lead to others very much broader than the original one of whether the Milwaukee Comrades made a mistake in tactics or not. The question now before the members of the Socialist Party is, not so much what will be done with Comrade Berger, as what will be done with the machinery of the Socialist Party, and we protest strongly against the use of the machinery of that party for such petty purposes as that for which some of the members of the party would now seek to use it. We believe that the Socialist Party has become too big to be thrown into a silly panic because one member or even one Local or state has taken a false step. In this connection we can not too highly commend the attitude which has been taken by the New York *Worker* and some of the comrades of that state. It is time that we were able to settle these

questions like men and not like children. The Socialist Party is neither a kindergarten nor an old woman's tea party.

It is time that socialists learned the distinction between discipline and discussion, between disagreement and treason. It is noteworthy that the Locals which have endorsed the Crestline resolutions to cut Wisconsin off from all connection with the National movement are almost all small locals. Their total membership would fall far short of that of Chicago, New York or Milwaukee.

We do not believe that any action by the party is necessary further than the enactment into our National constitution of an article which will make it clearly evident that any such action as that recently taken by Milwaukee is contrary to Socialist principle and tactics. There will then be no excuse for any violation in the future.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

As I have pointed out in previous numbers of the REVIEW, Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the A. F. of L., is running amuck in a vain attempt to kill off socialism. Because certain people called a convention to meet in Chicago last month to form a new industrial federation he declared that *the* Socialists were attempting to disrupt the A. F. of L. But you don't hear the "fair" Mr. Gompers discussing the peculiar situation that has developed on the Pacific Coast. According to the *Coast Seamen's Journal*, official organ of the sailors' union and a pure and simple sheet, a rump convention of longshoremen, composed of representatives from seven unions, was held in Seattle, Wash., at which a manifesto was prepared and is now being sent to all locals affiliated with the International Longshoremen, Marine and Transport Workers' Association inviting those bodies to join the secession movement. The circular is brim full of denunciation of industrialism as well as President Keefe of the International association, and its authors fervently declare for trade autonomy. The *Coast Seamen's Journal* praises the secessionists in the warmest terms and assures the latter "that the organized seamen will extend every aid in their power to make the new body a success, since in so doing they will not only be rendering service to their fellow-workers, but will also be furthering their own interests in proportion as the new body grows in power to establish and maintain the principles upon which it is founded." I wish to direct two questions at Mr. Gompers in this connection, and I will take pleasure in repeating them at the Pittsburg debate (if he agrees to a discussion, which he has not done up to date): First. Are *the* Socialists attempting to disrupt the longshoremen and transport workers' organization or are perhaps Republican and Democratic brethren in the deal? Secondly. Are not Mr. Gompers' friends, Furuseth, McArthur, Penje, et. al., guilty of treason in encouraging the disruptions? Will Samuel please explain?

Several more "workingman's friends" have displayed their claws during the past few weeks. For instance, when Mr. W. L. Douglass was elected governor of Massachusetts last fall quite a lot of labor leaders, so-called, went off into paroxysms of delight at the great "labor" victory. The first thing that Douglass did after learning of his election was to repudiate the "labor vote," declaring in an interview that the business people had elected him. Probably he regretted the "bar'l" that he was compelled to tap to keep the "flying squadrons" in a proper condition of enthusiasm. Anyhow, he seated himself in the gubernatorial chair and proceeded to "settle" the textile workers' strike in true capitalistic fashion. It will be recalled that some 25,000 men, women and children at Fall River, Mass., had been on strike for six months to resist a reduction of 12½ per cent. in their wages on top of a 10 per cent. cut that had been accepted a

few months previously. The strikers, in order to secure their surrender, were given assurances that the second reduction would probably amount to not more than $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But Douglass had no further need for labor votes now and so decided as arbitrator that "a partial restoration of wages is not warranted," and therefore the total cut of $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in less than a year stands. It is generally agreed that at the time when the wages in the Massachusetts mills were at the maximum they were hardly sufficient to enable the employes to properly feed, clothe and house themselves, and how they will exist henceforth with prices of necessities at top figures the Lord only knows. Douglass' decision, which means suffering and misery for thousands of poor women and children, was soon followed by a public statement to the effect that the "workingman's friend" would not accept a renomination from the Democratic party. This announcement was probably received with much sadness by the manipulators of the "flying squadrons," who "dragged politics into the unions" last fall, and dirty capitalistic politics at that, for fare you well. I am told that the labor grafters who controlled the "squadrons" denounced and wounded men who refused to vote for the demagogue, Douglass, in a manner that would bring joy to the Peabodys and Parrys, and that one of the rear-admirals received a "present" of \$5,000 from the shoe man. Not only has Douglass refused to be bled again this year by the political boddlers and heelers, but it is intimated that he intends to imitate his fellow plutocrat, Mr. Thomas W. Lawson, and relate something about "frenzied politics" after he leaves office, and how some men are bought like sausages and fish on the wharves. If he makes a clean breast of his political experience a few things may be forgiven "3.50."

Less than two years ago certain "labor leaders" of New York shouted themselves hoarse in proclaiming the many virtues of McClellan, Tammany candidate for mayor. He was a "workingman's friend" who would see that labor obtained its rights, they cried, and anyone who refused to vote for "Little Mac" was an enemy to society. And when McClellan was elected his boosters actually started a Presidential boom for him. Yet, in nearly every instance where organized labor has made a request for fair treatment McClellan has, since landing in office, turned the union people down hard. The worst blow of all was administered a couple of weeks ago, when, after five years of effort, the unions secured the enactment of a law providing for the eight-hour day and a slight increase of wages for street sweepers, drivers and other laborers who now work ten hours a day and seven days a week for \$60 per month. Although \$500,000 had been appropriated just previously by the administration for more pay for high-salaried employes, as well as new jobs, Mayor McClellan vetoed the bill to reduce the hours and raise the wages of the poor laborers, and went out of his way to make a bitter attack upon those responsible for the passage of the bill. While the raise given to the politicians amounted to half a million dollars annually, the increased pay provided for the laborers, 5,000 in number, would have amounted to a total of but \$300,000 a year, and work would also have been furnished to many more men who are now compelled to depend upon charity for an existence. Nothing is too good for the grafters and heelers, while the laborers who do useful work are kept at the starvation level and are abused and insulted by the shameless politicians besides. Those Eastern "labor leaders" who advise the rank and file to keep out of labor politics and allow themselves to be sold out should now renew their howls for McClellan for President, and, as his running mate, what's the matter with Governor Douglass! The platform might be written by Tom Platt, Senator from the United States Express Co. and another great "workingman's friend," who sits in his office in New York and dictates that the teamsters' strike in Chicago shall not be settled. Really if a lot of Hottentots or ring-nosed Zulus made as poor use of

their ballots as do our own bright, intelligent, patriotic American sovereigns we would have a right to pity them. It is small wonder that the great capitalists of the country have a hard job to hide the contempt that they feel for the working class.

Now the union smashers are spreading a fairy tale about a gang of sluggers having marked David M. Parry for a beating, who side-stepped the toughs by chasing off to Europe on a vacation. Union people are watching for details of this latest dime-novel narrative. They cannot be blamed if they refuse to believe everything that comes from employers' associations and their newspapers of alleged "confessions" made by some of their hired spies who are thugs one day and heroes the next. A short time ago columns of stuff appeared in the daily organs charging union sluggers with having killed a man by the name of Carlstrom in Chicago, and subsequently it turned out that his death was due to pneumonia. A little over a year ago the Independence (Col.) depot platform was blown up and all the satellites of capitalism immediately accused the union miners with being responsible for that horrible crime in which 14 men were blown into eternity, despite the fact that circumstantial evidence accumulated which indicated that the operators and their hirelings were guilty. When it appeared that the union-wreckers would have some difficulty in explaining away some suspicious circumstances and clues, a fellow named Robert Romaine, arrested for burglary and incarcerated in the Kansas penitentiary, handily bobbed up with a "confession" that he and some union miners did the job. Investigation proved that Romaine was a liar, and recently he admitted that his story was false and that one Frank Shaefer, an agent of the Mine Owners' Association, wired him to make the "confession" for a few dollars and a promise of freedom. But the daily organs, having spread the infamous lie broadcast, will not do the miners the justice of pronouncing them guiltless. It looks as though the heartless plutocracy has added a brand new department to its union-smashing campaign—that of having "confessions" made to order and springing them at a critical period in an industrial struggle.

Both the operators and miners are preparing for a national suspension of work next spring. One of the most prominent officials of the United Mine Workers informed me a few days ago that all indications point to a severe struggle not only in the bituminous districts, but in the anthracite field also. While the question of wages will be, as it always is, the principal issue at stake, other matters, such as the open shop policy in the anthracite districts, the "shot-firing" demand in the soft coal fields, honest weights and measures, the price of supplies, rents, etc., that have caused irritation in many places will in all probability be given considerable attention. In the hard coal region the men have been very indifferent to their own interests during the past year—in fact, after they secured their three years' agreement many of them became imbued with the hallucination that the operators were their friends and their unions were no longer necessary to safeguard working conditions, and to save a few dollars in dues they dropped into arrears or out of the organization altogether. At present every effort is being made to bring the miners back into the fold, and President Mitchell has taken personal charge of the work and expects to remain in the anthracite districts all summer to build up the locals. According to the officers, the soft-coal miners have plenty of reason to complain. Work has been exceptionally unsteady in the last year, thousands of the men averaging from two to four days a week, and so their earning power is exceedingly low, aside from the fact that they were compelled to accept a reduction of wages a year ago. The belief is general that the industry is overcrowded—that too many mines are in operation and too many men are looking for work in the trade. While under a scientific method of production the industry could be regulated to provide a good living for all, under the present system it is doubtful

whether any plan can be enforced to minimize the chronic evils that confront the miners. They will have to go on suffering because too much wealth is produced or is in sight, while the operators seem to thrive whether there is a scarcity or an overproduction of coal, and they are not the least backward in boosting prices, whittling down wages and openly preparing for a struggle with the workers who have enriched them. The pessimistic view of the officer referred to is likewise shared by one of the operators' officials with whom I discussed the situation recently. But the latter gentleman makes the novel claim that "the miners now have a new organization, which greatly differs from the old, conservative union, in that it has become socialistic in character!" He added: "You may be skeptical on this point, but I tell you I know what the miners are talking about. They are repeating socialistic phrases and making all sorts of wild and woolly claims, and pretty soon they will declare that the employers have no rights that they are bound to respect." He was asked why the miners did not vote the Socialist ticket in greater numbers and replied: "Well, I expect they will be foolish enough to fall into that habit, too." It is undoubtedly time that more or less of a socialistic sentiment is spreading among the miners, which is certainly not reflected in their official newspaper, however, or in the speeches of some of their officers, and perhaps if the militant Socialists pushed their campaign of education among the rank and file more earnestly and systematically those workers would give a good account of themselves at the ballot-box this fall.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

Events in Germany would seem to be reaching a sort of climax which will demand some changes in the traditional policy of German socialism. The reactionary movement, which found expression in taking the franchise away from the voters of Saxony, and in the growth of strong employers' associations, is now demanding the overthrow of universal suffrage. In Hamburg there have always been quite extensive property qualifications for voters. In this city an income of 1,200 marks (about \$300) has been necessary as a condition of suffrage. With the growth of the trade union movement the wages of a large proportion of workers had been forced up to this point and as a result there were thirteen socialists elected to the municipal council during the last two years. It thus became evident to the capitalists and nobility of Hamburg that unless some steps were taken the socialists would soon be in control of the city. They made no secret about their aims, but openly declared that they proposed to defend Hamburg from the "red flood." Consequently a law was introduced, which has already passed the upper house, and will undoubtedly become a part of the fundamental law of the city providing for election by classes. This law makes three divisions of the voting population, according as their incomes are below 3,000 marks, or above 6,000 or between these two amounts. Each of these classes will then elect an equal number of representatives. According to an estimate which has been made there will be 24,000 voters in the lowest class, 9,000 in the second and 7,000 in the third. It will be seen at once that this makes it impossible for the working class to ever obtain a majority.

The national congress of the German socialist trades unions was held in Cologne during the month of May. According to the official report of Legien the 213 delegates were present representing 1,252,000 organized working men in contrast with 156 delegates representing 681,000 at the last convention. In every way the condition of the union has improved to correspond with their number.

The principle questions of general interest which were discussed at the convention were those concerning the May Day celebration and the "mass strike," as the new utilization of the unions for political purposes is called, in contrast with the "general strike" in the anarchistic sense. On both of these questions the convention took rather an indefinite stand. The socialist press criticizes them quite strongly for their wavering position. The resolutions which were adopted were well nigh meaningless. There has been quite an extensive movement among the trade unions in favor of the general strike and also in favor of dissolving connection with the socialist party. The same persons, however, have seldom favored

both these positions. We have indeed the rather remarkable spectacle of Karl Kautsky and Bernstein standing together in advocacy of the general strike, in opposition to most of the trades union members of the socialist fraction in the Reichstag.

FRANCE.

The French socialists are very much disturbed over the question of patriotism versus internationalism. Gustaf Hervé has recently declared that he was opposed to war under any and all conditions and would not be in favor of fighting even if France was invaded, but would only take up arms in defense of the rise of the working class. Gérault-Richard was so much aroused by this statement that he refused to belong to the same party as Hervé and consequently has withdrawn, all of which partakes a little of the appearance of opera bouffe to the Anglo-Saxon mind.

BELGIUM.

The national convention of the socialist party was recently held at Brussels with 561 delegates present. The main question under discussion was that of alliance with the liberals. After considerable opposition a resolution offered by Vandervelde was adopted which permits temporary alliances to be made with those parties who will stand for universal equal suffrage.

In moving the resolution, however, Comrade Vandervelde declared that it was necessary to fight all bourgeois parties and expressed himself against such alliances.

A very encouraging report was received concerning the propaganda in the farming districts. A Flemish organization has recently been formed having the special work of carrying on the agitation in the Catholic agricultural sections. Steps were also taken to arrange for a more active work in the organization of trades unions.

NORWAY.

As has been reported in the daily press, Norway has practically dissolved the union between her and Sweden. This has caused much talk of war, but the Swedish socialists at once took occasion to meet and declare their opposition to any hostility and to express their sympathy for the Norwegian comrades. The Norwegian socialists in the meantime will endeavor to secure the formation of a republic, but they have little hopes of immediate success. In this same connection it is noteworthy that nearly all the telegraph dispatches concerning the present quarrel between France and Germany have stated that the question of war is very much complicated by the probable attitude of the socialists of the two countries. It is significant that socialism has reached the point where it is impossible for the rulers to plunge their countries into war and shed the blood of the workers without considering what those who must do the fighting think about it.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE WHITE TERROR AND THE RED, by *A. Cahan*. *A. S. Barnes & Co.* Cloth, 430 pp., \$1.50.

One does not need the publisher's note which accompanies this book to tell them that it was written by one who was a part of the things concerning which he wrote. Indeed one of the criticisms which we would make of the book is that the writer is so close to his subject that he sometimes can not see the forest for the trees and crowds his canvas with events and figures until the reader feels that he had much better have made two or three books from the material he had in hand.

The book is a story of that strange romantic Russian revolutionary movement which it betrays, ends in the rotting darkness of a Russian military and devotion on the part of the educated classes and the peasant, and which ended in an equally fanatical, unreasoning and almost as fruitless reign of terror. It would be presumption on our part to make any judgment as to whether the events portrayed are true to life or not, but they certainly are alive and moving. We see the gradual growth of the revolutionary enthusiasm in a young noble as he progresses through the college and comes in touch at various points with the Russian autocracy.

Then we live for a time in that strange underground Russia and see it in all its nakedness. There is heroism in plenty and along with it the petty jealousies, and personalities that prove conspirators for the cause of human freedom to be very much like other men and women.

The work is a series of brilliant flash-lights thrown upon these phases of the Russian revolutionary movement. We see here how the first blind worship of the Russian peasant deified his most disreputable actions, as, for instance, Jew-baiting. The picture which is given of one of these terrible Jewish massacres is one of the strongest portions of the book, and its horrors will cling to the reader's mind long after he has laid the book aside. The work is tragic in almost every feature and, like the phase of the movement of the early eighties, which began in a pouring out of enthusiasm into prison. His characters are real men and women and none of them are demi-gods or devils. In literary style, plot and character, it is something distinctly different from conventional literature. We have the same peculiar introspection that is to be found in Ghorki and also the same unlovely types. It does not grip one with the same power as does the books of some of the Russian writers, yet it possesses a strange fascination which will not permit the reader who has once begun it to lay it aside until the end has been reached.

L'AVENIR DU SOCIALISME, by *Paul Louis*. *Bibliothèque-Charpentier, Paris*. Paper, 316 pages. 3 fr. 50.

After a survey of the existing socialist situation in various countries the author proceeds to a study of the forces which are working within the

socialist movement. He considers revisionism, which he looks upon as injurious; discusses the relation which trades unions hold to the socialist party in foreign countries and all the different forces that are at work in forming and modifying socialist thought and tactics. In the second part of the work he considers the evolution of socialist doctrines, especially with relation to nationalism and the influence of the "intellectuals." His chapter on this subject is extremely suggestive and interesting. He recognizes the fact of the ever-increasing number of this class in the socialist movement, but warns against the tendency to turn over the direction of the party into their hands. The final division of the book is given up to the discussion of the problems of socialism, including its relation to religion, militarism, the farmer question, the general strike and respect for legality. On the whole he supports the position of the extreme left wing of socialism, denouncing in measured terms all alliances with all bourgeois parties and leans toward the further extension of the general strike.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

THE LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS.

No experiment in the history of our co-operative publishing house has ever met with the instant success that has welcomed our start on the publication of the *Library of Science for the Workers*. The opening volume, "*The Evolution of Man*," has been out scarcely two months, but the first edition of 2,000 copies is already sold and another edition printed. This means that in sixty days enough books have been sold to pay the cost of publication, so that the bills have been paid without drawing on our capital. If this success can be repeated with the other volumes of the series, we shall be able to bring them out in rapid succession from this time on.

The second volume, *GERMS OF MIND IN PLANTS*, translated by A. M. Simons, is now in the hands of the printers, and we expect to have copies ready for delivery in early August. It is equally fascinating in style with *THE EVOLUTION OF MAN*, it is equally easy reading, and it is even more startling in the new scientific discoveries which it unfolds. At first glance it may seem a long way from the subject of this book to the principles of socialism, but the connection is close after all. We as socialists have to show that the mind of man is molded by man's economic environment. This book makes our task easy by showing how the first beginnings of mind are the outcome of natural forces.

The third volume in this library, *THE END OF THE WORLD*, translated by Margaret Wagner, will be ready in September, and will be fully described in the August REVIEW. We wish now to call attention to the special offer of the three volumes postpaid for one dollar, provided the money is sent to this office on or before July 31. On receipt of the remittance, we will send *THE EVOLUTION OF MAN* by return mail, and the other two volumes will be mailed on publication. This special offer is made simply to provide the money to print the new books, and it will not be extended beyond July 31. The price of the volumes will thenceforth be fifty cents each, without discount to any one, except to stockholders in our co-operative publishing house. To them the price

will be 30 cents a volume postpaid, or 25 cents a volume if sent at purchaser's expense.

A share of stock costs ten dollars, and may be paid for at the rate of a dollar a month. It draws no dividends, but it carries with it the right to buy the company's books at cost. The company's price list already includes nearly all the most important works on socialism. It will now be rapidly enlarged to include the latest and best books of popular science.

THE COMPANY'S FINANCES.

In last month's REVIEW an offer was made by Charles H. Kerr to duplicate the contributions of all other stockholders for the purpose of paying off what remains of the debt and putting the company on a cash basis. This will make it possible to use all money coming from the sale of stock to bring out new books, and it will also relieve the company from the burden of interest, so that future profits from book sales can be used to publish more books. The amounts contributed during June were as follows:

H. A. Munro, Alabama	\$ 1.00
E. F. Everitt, California	2.00
William A. Whittiker, Connecticut	3.00
Mrs. Clarence Mackay, New York	50.00
"B," Massachusetts	10.00
E. H. Bramball, Maine	3.00
N. O. Nelson, Illinois	50.00
E. P. Clark, Connecticut50
J. A. Teit, British Columbia	1.10
M. V. Ball, Pennsylvania	2.00
F. M. Crunden, Missouri	10.00
Charles S. Wheeler, Illinois	5.00
Jules L. Kugler, Massachusetts40
J. I. Livingston, New York	10.00
Mrs. S. D. Whitney, California	21.00
W. H. Hueckel, Illinois	20.00
F. N. Prevey, Ohio	1.00
Rudolph Pusch, Illinois	1.00
Local Franklin, Socialist Party, Pennsylvania	1.00
Jacob Bruning, Illinois	25.00
W. R. Hale, South Carolina	5.00
T. J. Lloyd, New York	5.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	227.00

Total,\$454.00

One thing we wish to make clear in connection with this effort to free the company from debt. That is that the debt does not represent a deficit. We have not been running the book business at a loss; on the contrary there has been a profit which has just about balanced the loss

on the REVIEW. What the debt means is that we have never had more than a small fraction of the capital really needed to bring out the books required by the socialist movement, and thus we have had to use our credit.

For years we carried a floating debt to printers and banks of several thousand dollars. This is all paid off, except \$400 to one bank on which we pay 7 per cent interest. Some money has been lent by stockholders, and most of this is at four per cent interest and can be kept as long as we need it. One stockholder, however, lent us \$1,600 at 6 per cent two years ago. He needs to use the money as soon as we can raise it for him. The company has paid him \$100 quite recently, leaving \$1,500 still to be paid. We can save an interest charge of \$90 a year by getting this debt out of the way.

One comrade accompanied a contribution by a rather gloomy letter to the effect that he did not want to contribute to a house that was "always in hot water." But the company got itself out of the "hot water" some time ago. Its solvency does not depend at all upon the raising of this debt fund. We can if necessary pay off every dollar of the debt in time by using for this purpose all the money that comes in from the sale of stock, and all the profit from the sale of books, instead of using the money to publish the REVIEW and to make plates of new books.

The question is whether the stockholders prefer this plan rather than raising the debt now so that the money that comes in hereafter can be used to enlarge the company's work. Those whose names appear in the list prefer to raise the debt now. How do the others feel about it?

In the June REVIEW, the offer of Charles H. Kerr to duplicate the contributions of other stockholders was limited to the month of June. He has however concluded to extend the offer to the end of 1905, so as to get the debt out of the way once for all. It will not be a hard thing to do if all who can will help.

Our co-operative publishing house is no longer a mere experiment. The early stockholders put in their money upon what was then at least an even chance of seeing it lost without any results being accomplished. Still, they took the chance, and they have the satisfaction of being joint owners in the largest and most successful socialist book publishing house in the United States, if not in the world.

This simply means that in our co-operative organization we have hit on the right plan. We have an efficient and economical management combined with democratic control. Nine-tenths of the stock is held in single shares of ten dollars each. It only remains to pay off what is left of the debt, and we shall have a solidly established publishing house that will be in no way dependent on the life of one individual, but will continue to circulate the literature of socialism until the time comes to turn over its assets to the co-operative commonwealth.

If you are not already a stockholder, you can help by subscribing for a share. If you are a stockholder you can help by contributing your fair proportion toward paying off the debt.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

AUGUST, 1905

NO. 2

Industrial Workers of the World.

THE convention which met at Brand's hall, Chicago, from June 27th to July 8th, in spite of all the denunciations of the opponents and the strictures of critics, in my opinion marks a decisive turning point in American working class history. It means the formation of a nucleus of those who are determined that organizations of the working class shall reflect the industrial facts. It marks the beginning of the end of Civic Federationism and craft war in the American labor movement.

No attempt will be made to give a detailed account of the debates and general proceedings. These have already been published from various points of views and with varying accuracy in numerous socialist papers.

The signers of the original call for the convention were confronted by a dilemma from which it can not be said they were wholly successful in extricating themselves. They desired to bring together for conference all those who were ready to adopt the principle of industrial unionism. It was recognized that very many individuals connected with the old trade unions were incapable of bringing the unions along with them. Even those unions which were most favorable to the organization did not wish to take a leap in the dark into an organization which did not yet exist. Therefore the call was so worded as to permit of individual delegates.

The proceedings of the convention showed this to have been a mistake. It was taken advantage of to create paper organizations and to admit all sorts of persons representing nothing on earth but themselves. Many of these were diligent workers with the weapon with which we have Biblical authority that Sampson created so much slaughter among the Philistines. As a result there was much ground for calling the first few days of the session a *talkfest*. However, this time was not really wasted. The talk

gave an opportunity not only to blow off steam and thus relieve the pressure during the rest of the convention, but it also placed many individuals on record in such a way that the bona fide trade unionists who did the actual work of the convention, and by whom it will be conducted in the future, were enabled to determine the real value of this class.

MAKE UP OF CONVENTION.

The convention was made up of seventy delegates representing 51,430 men ready to be installed in the new organization. In addition there were 72 delegates representing 91,500 men, who, while sympathizing with the new organization did not have authority to install, and 61 individual delegates. While all of these will not join the new organization in the immediate future yet a large percentage of them will and the absence of those who will not join has already been offset by the adherence of organizations which were not represented at the convention. It is a very low estimate of the strength of the new organization to expect that within six months it will have one hundred thousand members.

In spite of all the reports that have been sent out the gathering was far more harmonious than any socialist or trade union convention that has been held in recent years. There were plenty of oratorical fire works, some rather disgusting personalities from a few individuals who have become notorious for their records along these lines, but all of these things were confined to the little group of jaw smiths described above. Men who really represented anything and who really will do the work in the union, as they did in the convention were far more harmonious than might have been expected when it is remembered that they were called together to formulate new principles of organization. The only line of cleavage between bodies representing any strength was over the method of organization. Even here the difficulty was much less fundamental than the heat of debate would indicate.

The constitution committee brought in a report arbitrarily dividing the industrial field into thirteen departments. Delegate David C. Coates sought to amend this so that each industry would form a union on an equality with every other union. As might have been expected both sides were inclined to exaggerate their own position and sometimes it appeared as if the Coate's amendment was seeking to restore trade rather than industrial autonomy. The matter was finally settled by the adoption of a compromise in the form of an amendment to the original report reading as follows:

"The International and National Industrial Unions shall have complete industrial autonomy in their respective international

affairs, provided the executive board shall have power to control these industrial unions, in matters concerning the interest of the general welfare." Before the vote was taken on this amendment Chairman Haywood gave it as his opinion that this meant that charters for each industrial union would be given directly by the general executive board. None of the members of the constitution committee who were present objected to this interpretation.

FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Invitations had been sent by the secretary of the parliamentary committee to the various European countries asking for their co-operation. Since there has been some misrepresentation concerning the replies received we include translations of the principal portions of the replies from Germany and France.

The German letter was as follows:

"After mature consideration the commission has concluded to refrain from sending fraternal delegates to this congress, although they fervently hope that a better connection may be created between American and German unions than has hitherto existed. The reason we do not send delegates to the Congress is, not that we do not sympathize with the movement in America, but we do not think it advisable to enter actively into the fermenting process (*gährungsprozess*) through which the union movement of America is now passing. The sending of delegates to your Congress would amount to active participation, since these delegates would not only be expected to represent the German unions in Chicago, but they would also be in duty bound to give the benefit of their experience and thus participate in the construction of a new organization. The central administration of the German unions has always held to the principle that it is not advisable to interfere in the development of a movement of any country from outside, since this development must proceed unhindered by outside interference. So we consider that the time has not yet come for us to send delegates to our comrades in America. But we hope that there may soon be a purification (*klärung*) in the American union movement and that an organization may appear that will correspond to modern ideas. As to whether this organization will evolve from those existing or will be a new creation we will not attempt to judge. At any rate we shall strictly keep from any external influence. We beg the comrades to consider these reasons for not sending a delegation and to assure them that we are in full sympathy with the struggle of the laborers of America for emancipation. I would request further that you send me some of the plans of organization, in German, since some of our unions have expressed a desire to receive these plans. In

the hope that we may soon see complete fraternal co-operation with the organization work of your country, I am,

Yours fraternally, C. LEGIEN."

The French comrades wrote as follows:

"Although we are not able to participate directly in this union movement we are in full sympathy with you and we hope that your consolidated method of uniting the workers may develop your movement on a solid economic and social foundation and never deviate from the platform of the class struggle, a platform that is the reason for existence of union organizations, having for its aim the actual betterment of the conditions of the workers and also the disappearance of the capitalist class in order to bring about the complete emancipation of the working class.

Yours fraternally, E. POUGET."

OUTLOOK FOR NEW MOVEMENT.

What then, does this organization present that is new and better than what has previously existed in the industrial field. Even its enemies must admit that it has been successful in devising a plan of organization that provides for democratic management and control without in any way restricting effective centralized administration. The election of the General Executive Board by each Department separately will make impossible any such ring rule as now prevails in the A. F. of L., as it is inconceivable that a central machine could control as many separate electorates, or even a majority of them, and this granting that there would be any object in organizing a ring to capture a body so thoroughly subject to the control of the rank and file.

But the most distinctive feature of this organization, even more important than the "Industrial" form from which it takes its name, is that it is organized in accordance with, and for the definite purpose of waging the class struggle. This does not mean, as some critics would have us believe, that the delegates to that convention did not know that whenever and wherever man met master in conflict over the conditions of the wage-bargain, that the class-struggle was present. But with the unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. the class struggle has been waged in spite of the form of organization, and only because that struggle, like the air around them, was a part of their environment and could not be avoided. Nominally they shut their eyes to its existence and at Civic Federation banquets and mutual admiration conferences prated of the unity of interests between the master and the wage-slave. It is probably true that the first man that asked his boss for more wages was engaged in the class-struggle,

in the same way that it is also true (at least physicists assure us of the fact) that every time a handful of dirt is moved the most distant stars swerve in their courses to readjust the balance of the material universe. But we are not dealing with metaphysical gymnastics. When we speak of a labor organization being founded upon the class-struggle we mean that those who formulate its principles and direct its policies are *consciously* so doing, and that the organization which they are directing and of which they are a part does not claim to be able to ignore that struggle.

The subject of the industrial form of organization has been so frequently discussed in these columns and in the labor press in general as to need no further elaboration. There seems to be an almost universal agreement, among socialists at least, that industrial organization is desirable, and that it is the future form under which labor must unite on the economic field. But, *but*, BUT—we are told, with all sorts of variations, the A. F. of L. is going to be transformed into an industrial organization within a few years. It is going to endorse socialism and then you will have received all that you want without any fuss or disturbance. You will have made an omelet without injuring the eggs. First, last, foremost and hindmost, this is the sum, substance, shell and kernel of all that has appeared in the Socialist Party press in opposition to the formation of this new industrial union. To be sure this has been concealed under considerable personal abuse, some shallow ridicule, a good deal of ignorance as to what has really been done by those concerned in the new movement, and a little, just a *very* little, (?) downright lying about the proceedings of the convention. Let us then see what there is in this argument. What signs are there that the A. F. of L. is moving towards industrialism? Let us have some definite evidence. It will not do to point to the U. M. W. or the Brewers that have succeeded by virtue of pure brute strength in swallowing all allied crafts, for neither of these unions look with any great favor upon the A. F. of L. or consider that it has in any way helped them in securing what industrial features they now possess. But such a swallowing process as the carpenters are anxious to practice on the wood-workers is not a step toward industrialism. Industrialism is not “benevolent assimilation” of the weaker by the stronger unions, but implies the co-operative interdependent organization of all crafts in one unified body, yet with equal protection for all trades.

But we are told of the marvelous progress that is being made toward bringing the A. F. of L. to socialism. I would be the last to deny that the “boring-from-within” tactics have not educated a vast number of the rank and file to the truths of socialism. I have seen too much of this to be blind to its existence. Nor would I want to see such work hindered for one moment. But the A. F. of L. is something almost wholly distinct from the

rank and file of the membership. Indeed it is practically outside their control, and the general effect of educating any man to socialism has been to educate him *out* of the A. F. of L., that is out of the official Gompers machine. So far as that machine is concerned, no one dare deny that it is further from Socialism than at any time in its existence. At one time it was rather inclined to play with socialist phrases. Today, under the inspiration of scab banquets and Civic Federation oratory it declares open war on socialism.

Furthermore I believe it to be a fact of such general validity as to be almost a law of social evolution that no voluntary association, having as changeable a social base as the modern trade-union can be altered in any essential manner without complete disruption. I have given considerable investigation to this particular point and have searched quite closely in the history of organizations and I have yet to find an instance where an organization was "captured" and effectively utilized for a different purpose than that which brought it together. I know that this is contrary to all popular ideas on the subject, but I believe that, as is frequently the case, the popular opinion is wrong. Certainly there is no instance of such a fundamental change in a militant fighting organization as that which would be implied in changing the A. F. of L. to the industrial form. Whoever, therefore, advocates such a change from within the A. F. of L. is pursuing a course which will certainly end in the destruction of that organization. It has been to no small degree due to such work that there is now a large body of men ready to leave the A. F. of L. and unite with the Industrial Workers of the World.

Different stages in industrial evolution in America have produced different forms of labor organizations. The National Labor Union, the Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor were each suited to the stage in which they appeared. Today when competition has given way to monopoly, when the trust has superseded the corporation, when Citizens' Alliances and Employers' Associations have united previously competing purchasers of labor power, and when the personal relation of employer and employe has been supplanted by the carefully planned, and cold-blooded, merciless class-war, the A. F. of L. is as hopelessly out of date as the stage-coach and the flint-lock musket.

Finally, the A. F. of L. has not only proved itself incapable of effectively fighting the battle of those who are included within its ranks, it has also shown that its organizing ability is inadequate, or its principles too unattractive, or its benefits too uncertain to enable it to reach whole armies of the working class who are in need of, and who are ready for organization. More significant still the A. F. of L. and its constituent unions close their door to large bodies of workers whose organization is

demanded, not only in their own interest, but as a part of the whole great working-class phalanx. From all these sources the new union, can, and will, recruit its forces.

THE CONSTITUTION.

The constitution as adopted lays the foundation for a strong, effective, compact fighting organization. It is too long to be given in full here, and much of it concerns matters of detail that are common to all organizations. Moreover a copy of it can be obtained by addressing the Secretary-Treasurer, Comrade William E. Trautman, 148 W. Madison St., Chicago, Ill. The following summarizes its principal features and includes all that are peculiar to it.

The first article provides for the division of the field into thirteen "International Industrial Departments," with the amendment given elsewhere in this article. It also provides for the internal organization of these departments and for other general bodies. The second article provides for the election of the President and Secretary-Treasurer by referendum of the entire membership from the three who shall be nominated for each of these offices by the general convention. This section also provides for the General Executive Board, the real governing power of the organization, next to the general membership, and defines its powers and duties. This board is to be composed of one member from each of the industrial departments. This board has general supervision of all matters, such as agreements between unions and employers, levying of special assessments, control of the official organ, and the calling out of any organizations aside from those directly involved in the original struggle.

The articles dealing with finances are as follows:

ARTICLE III.

"Section 1. The Revenue of the Organization shall be derived as follows: Charter fees for International Industrial Departments shall be \$25.00. Charter fees for District Councils and Local Unions shall be \$10.00.

Sec. 2. International Industrial Departments shall pay as general dues into the treasury of the Industrial Workers of the World the rate of 8 1-3 cents per month per member; Industrial Councils shall pay a flat rate of \$1.00 per month for the Organization; Local Unions shall pay 25 cents per member per month, together with such assessments as may be levied as provided for in Art. II, Sec. 4.

Sec. 3. Individual Industrial members may be admitted to

membership-at-large in the Organization as provided for in Art. I, Sec. 2 (d), on payment of \$2.00 initiation fee and 50 cents per month dues, together with such assessments as may be levied by the General Executive Board as provided for in Art. II, Sec. 4, all of which shall be paid to the General Secretary-Treasurer, provided Members-at-large shall remain such so long as they are outside the jurisdiction of a Local Union subordinate to the General Organization; but on moving within the jurisdiction of a Local Union of the Industrial Workers of the World, or any of its subordinate organizations, they shall transfer their membership from the union-at-large to the Local Union in whose jurisdiction they are employed.

The initiation fee for members of Local Unions, as provided for in Art. I, Sec. 2 (c) and Art. II, Sec. 5, shall be \$2.00. The monthly dues shall be 50 cents per month, together with such assessments as may be levied as provided for in Art. II, Sec. 5, provided no part of the initiation fee or dues above mentioned shall be used as a sick or death benefit, but shall be held in the treasury as a general fund to defray the legitimate expenses of the Union.

All International Industrial Unions, subordinate to the Industrial Workers of the World, shall charge for initiation fee in their respective Unions not less than \$1.50 nor more than \$5.00, as in their judgment the conditions will justify.

All International Industrial Departments, subordinate to the Industrial Workers of the World, shall collect from the membership of their organization a per capita tax at the rate of 25 cents per member per month, provided that no part of the above mentioned monies shall be used for sick, accident or death fund, but shall be held in the treasury of International Industrial Departments for the purpose of paying the legitimate expenses of maintaining the organizations.

ARTICLE IV.

DEFENSE FUND AND HOW MAINTAINED.

Section 1. The dues received by the General Organization shall be divided as follows: 2 1-3 cents of the 8 1-3 cents per month per member received from International Industrial Departments shall be placed into a defense fund, the remaining 6 cents to be placed into the general fund.

Sec. 2. Five cents of the 25 cents per member per month received from Local Unions paying directly to headquarters will be placed into the defense fund, the balance to be placed into the general fund.

Sec. 3. Individual members receiving membership cards direct from the General Organization shall pay to headquarters

50 cents per month, all of which is to be placed into the defense fund.

PAYMENT FROM DEFENSE FUND.

Section 1. Whenever a strike has been duly and legally entered upon, in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution, the General Executive Board shall have power to order payments from the defense fund, for the purpose of conducting the same and supporting those involved, until such strike has been duly and legally declared off by the General Executive Board; but no payments shall be made from the defense fund as donations or contributions, or for any other purpose, except to conduct strikes or lockouts and pay benefits in cases where strikes or lockouts have been duly and legally approved by the General Executive Board.

Sec. 2. *Strike Pay and Rates Of.*—Strike pay shall not be allowed to strikers until they have, in each separate case, been out on a legalized strike, or are being locked out, for a period exceeding seven (7) consecutive days and the strike allowance after seven consecutive days shall be stipulated and regulated by the General Executive Board and shall be paid only to those who were actually working when the strike or lockout began and who were called out, or their lockout caused by such procedures as are in conformity with the provisions of this Constitution; providing, however, that the General Executive Board may make provisions for those who were not working at the time when the conflict started. This authority may be used to a very limited extent in extraordinary cases only.

Sec. 3. *Unions—When Suspended.*—All Industrial Departments, Local Unions and individual members of the Industrial Workers of the World that are in arrears for dues and assessments for sixty (60) days, counting from the last day of the month for which reports and remittances are due, shall not be considered in good standing and shall not be entitled to any of the benefits or payments from any funds of this Organization."

The sixth article provides for the basis of representation at the annual convention as follows:

ARTICLE VI.

CONVENTION.

"Section 1. The Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be held on the first Monday in May of each year at such place as may be determined by previous convention.

Sec. 2. Delegates to the Annual Convention shall be as here-

inafter provided for. The General President, the General Secretary-Treasurer and other members of the General Executive Board shall be delegates-at-large with one vote each, but shall not be accredited delegates nor carry the vote of any union or organization.

Sec. 3. Industrial Departments shall have one delegate for the first 4,000, or less, of its members; for more than 4,000 and up to 7,000 members they shall have two delegates; for more than 7,000 and less than 20,000 members they shall have three delegates; for more than 20,000 and less than 40,000 members they shall have four delegates; for more than 40,000 members and less than 80,000 members they shall have five delegates; for more than 80,000 and less than 160,000 members they shall have six delegates, and for more than 160,000 members they shall have seven delegates.

Sec. 4. Local Unions, chartered directly by the Industrial Workers of the World, shall have one delegate for 200 members, or less, and one additional delegate for each additional 200, or major fraction thereof.

Sec. 5. When two or more delegates are representing any Local Union, or International Industrial Union or Industrial Department in the Convention, the vote of their respective organization shall be equally divided between such delegates.

Sec. 6. Representation in the Convention shall be based on the National Dues paid to the General Organization for the last six months of each fiscal year and each union and organization entitled to representation in the Convention shall be entitled to one vote for its first fifty (50) of its members and one additional vote for each additional fifty (50) of its members, or major fraction thereof.

This plan, while granting added power to the larger unions in proportion to their numbers, yet so modifies this as to prevent any single organization from ruling the entire convention as does the U. M. W. in the A. F. of L. conventions at the present time."

Other miscellaneous provisions of considerable importance are as follows:

"Sec. 10. There must be a Universal Label for the entire Organization. All unions, departments and individual members must procure supplies, such as membership books, official buttons, labels, badges and stamps from the General Secretary-Treasurer, all of which shall be of uniform design.

Sec. 11. There shall be a free interchange of cards between all organizations subordinate to the Industrial Workers of the World and any Local Union, or International Industrial Union, or Industrial Department shall accept, in lieu of initiation fee, the

paid-up membership card of any recognized labor union or organization.

ARTICLE VII.

Section 1. The General Executive Board, or not less than ten (10) locals in at least three (3) industries, may initiate a referendum on any subject to be submitted to the Convention.

Sec. 2. A majority vote cast shall rule in the General Organization and its subordinate parts, except as otherwise provided for in this Constitution.

Sec. 3. None but actual wage workers shall be admitted as members-at-large.

Sec. 4. So soon as there are ten (10) Local Unions with not less than 3,000 members in any one industry, the General Executive Board shall immediately proceed to call a Convention of that industry and proceed to organize them as an International Industrial Department of the Industrial Workers of the World.

INCIDENTS OF THE CONVENTION.

Just a few general observations on the work of the convention. In the first place as to the part played by De Leon and his followers. So far as the "talkfest" stage of proceedings was concerned his crowd had a decided advantage. There were about thirty of his followers from organizations whose total membership even on paper would not exceed two thousand. The western delegates were inclined to look upon the trouble between the S. L. P. and the S. P. as partaking largely of a personal quarrel. They were not familiar with the years of falsification, intrigue and general crookedness that had marked the career of De Leon, therefore they could not understand why, when De Leon was ready to promise to cease fighting that the S. P. men should not be "equally generous." As the convention progressed, however, and his true character became apparent there was a revulsion of feeling which showed itself in the vote on the executive committee.

A word of personal explanation may also be worth while, with regard to the notorious "Lawyer incident," especially as the truth concerning the matter has not yet appeared in any publication.

Comrade Boudin, the well known contributor to the columns of the REVIEW had spoken to me about sending in his credentials as delegate. I told him that if objection was made on the ground of being a lawyer that I should not attempt to defend him, much as I liked him personally and thoroughly as I recognized his ability. However, I was scarcely prepared for the sort of fight the DeLeonites put up. They saw an opportunity in the attempt to

seat a lawyer to play the "holier than thou" act for all it was worth, and proceeded to express their horrible detestation at the very idea of seating a lawyer. When several speeches of this kind had been made I arose and spoke about as follows:

"I want to show the convention something of the honesty and sincerity of those who are now raving about lawyers by informing them that the only organization on the floor of this hall that admits lawyers to its membership is the S. T. & L. A. and that the very individual whom they are now fighting was not only a member of their organization, but was for one year a member of their national executive committee. However, I agree with the general principle that this organization should not accept lawyers to membership, and shall so vote."

I therefore voted against the seating of Comrade Boudin, and DeLeon's statement which was followed by several of the S. P. papers that I sought to have a lawyer seated is simply a falsification.

Many socialist papers have attempted to show that the convention was captured by De Leon. I do not care to enter into the merits and demerits of De Leon's activity in the convention, but the fact is there was but one test of the strength which he actually controlled and that was in the election of the two members at large for the temporary executive board. De Leon seconded the nomination of Thomas C. Powers and his supporters made special pleas for his election. When the votes were counted, however, they stood as follows. Each delegate voted for two and the two highest being elected:

John Riordan	40,446
F. W. Cronin	33,554
Pat O'Neill	8,278
Powers	7,189

We would also refer our readers to the communication by Comrade Debs which appears elsewhere in this number for further information on this and other points concerning which there has been considerable reckless talk.

There has been much discussion about what attitude the Socialist Party should take towards this new organization. I can not see that it is called upon to act officially in any manner whatever. While nearly every official of the new organization is a member of the Socialist Party not one of them, so far as I have been able to discover, wishes to involve the party in any way. If, however, those editors of socialist papers and officials of the Socialist Party who have organized unions for the purpose of getting themselves elected to national conventions and posing as trades union leaders, insist on waging a fierce war against the

new organization and everybody connected with it; if an attempt is made to draw up a black list of speakers and place every one on it who does not subscribe to the A. F. of L. catechism, then it is easy to see that there will be trouble ahead. The men connected with the industrial union movement have taken every precaution to avoid involving the party and if trouble comes it will be because of those who are so anxious to gain the favor of the A. F. of L. officials that they must heap their abuse on every one who does not kow-tow to their pure and simple god.

A. M. SIMONS.

Why I am Content in Journalism.

HAVING been both a minister and a socialist lecturer, I am now primarily a journalist, writing editorials for a daily paper of large circulation, and am quite content in the metamorphosis. This willingness to give up the ministry for which, even as a child I felt an impelling passion, and to lay aside, temporarily, a work which still appeals to me as the best the world offers, rests upon principles which seem to me important and interesting. The fact of the change depends on prosaic necessity, no doubt; contented acquiescence therein involves for me convictions born of slow processes, but now most inspiring.

I was ordained in 1899, after a university course in which philosophy, history and sociology took the place of theological studies. My interest in economic and social problems had been keen from childhood, but my religious interest was always in the ascendancy, so that, although a woman, I cannot remember when I did not expect to preach. It may be of interest to remark in passing, that this desire and purpose never received the slightest discouragement but was always accepted by relations, friends and teachers as quite a matter of course. The same experience met me after graduation, and I began and continued my ministry without meeting any obstacles because of sex. As good or better openings came to me always as came to young men of like experience. In the second year of my ministry, I was called to a pulpit in a Western city of about 75,000 people. Here the first outcropping of industrial issues met me. A street car strike occurred, and with the audacity of youth I opened fire on the question, preaching on the necessity of labor organization and strikes, at the height of the local excitement. A few of the members gave up attendance at church, but, as a whole, the membership and officials were patient and tolerant. Afterward, although my interest in industrial questions was always apparent and my

*The above article was sent to *The Independent* in response to an invitation to ministers to explain their position toward social and economic subjects. The editor declined it because it arrived "too late." It is noteworthy in connection with this symposium that the editor remarks that, while they expected the discussion to cover the entire field of economic subjects and their relation to the ministry they found that all the articles dealt with the relation of christianity to socialism. To the socialists this simply affords one more illustration of the fact that socialism really occupies the entire field and is the only movement really offering any "problem" in relation to capitalism or any of its phases.

views pronounced on the radical side of all issues as they then arose no crisis in my relations with my congregation came. Possibly, had no other elements entered to interfere with denominational free sailing, I might to this day have been contentedly ministering to some congregation, keeping my views all unconsciously, within the limits which would have been tolerated as a harmless fad.

Fortunately a break came with my denomination on grounds neither theological nor industrial, and for eight years I continued my preaching as an independent minister, with unquestioned success in winning audiences, inspiring community activities and public recognition, but with not enough of pecuniary support to place any serious temptation in the way of free conviction and expression.

For I must confess that a close observation of ministerial human nature, as well as that in educational, political and journalistic atmospheres, has forcibly confirmed my socialist theory that with individuals, as with society, the psychological makeup is a close reflex of the underlying material interest, and I would not venture to assume positively that I would have been among the rare exceptions to this rule. As it was, few of the subtle chains which, unconsciously to their victims, bind public teachers, hindered the growth of an intense enthusiasm for industrial reforms. From the time of the Bellamy days, I called myself a Socialist, lecturing frequently on the subject as I then viewed it, but believing that reform, after the manner of Bryanism, was the necessary preparatory "evolution."

In 1900 I chanced to live in a state in which the most advanced reform movement was in official control. Several laws representing high water mark in progressive political measures were carried by the legislature and the "step at a time" process toward socialism seemed well under way. About this time I frequently gave an address at socialist meetings, trying to convince them how foolish they were to refuse their assistance to the fine reforms that were being gained. These suggestions were met in the discussions by the socialist theory that working class figs never grew on the thistles of Capitalist class rule, and events proved only too clearly the truth of their position. By a succession of delays, court decisions, corrupt elections and the most daring capitalistic lawlessness every vestige of these justly heralded reforms have been either swept away or made ineffective by the manner of their final application.

In an early stage of this process, I became convinced that the strictly Marxian Socialists were right and have since regarded nothing as fundamentally important but such illumination of economic laws as should teach co-operation with the forces pushing

toward an industry, uncursed by economic class divisions and unclogged by rent, interest and profit.

I gave up all attempts to preach to congregations from which no united economic effort could be expected, and for several years gave all my time to teaching Socialism in classes, lectures and party organization.

Although my religious interest had not ebbed and although the preacher's yearning to arouse spiritual fervor in dormant natures was as strong as ever, this socialist activity more than satisfied. My religious convictions were born of an ardent acceptance of scientific philosophy as voiced by Spencer, Huxley and Tyndall, and as interpreted by John Fiske, E. P. Powell and the more radical religious teachers of the day. My college course in metaphysics had left me somewhat supercilious regarding these men as philosophers, but the practical requirements of a rational religious ministry led me to a grateful appreciation of the cosmic truths these thinkers made real.

Into the sense of that "God of things as they are," thus gained, the socialism of Karl Marx fitted with an intellectual and spiritual completeness exultantly satisfying. The chief work of Spencer, Darwin and Marx was done in the same decade. They all breathe the same reverence for facts, the same sense of immanent and omnipotent law, the same awe-inspiring consciousness of organic unity. As Spencer swung full circle in the prophetic outline of universal law, as Darwin faithfully, slowly worked out that law in its biological minuteness, so Karl Marx discovered the same law in the complexities of sociology and its foundation science, economics.

Humanity and all nature vibrated with a divine significance for me because of the cosmic message of evolutionary law, even before I knew of Marx's gospel. This attitude made most welcome my largely Utopian conception of earlier Socialism. It required faith for its acceptance; but some goal, free from the tragedies and the dwarfings of society as I saw it, seemed a necessary postulate if the universal development were not to be proven a farce. Scientific Socialism changed this faith and hope into confident assurance based on laws indisputable and universally operative, and added inexpressible dignity and beauty to the cosmic order.

In ordinary economic instruction, the impression is given that the theory of value is the Alpha and Omega of Karl Marx's philosophy. On the contrary, this is but one phase of an inclusive teaching. The theory of value involves surplus values and the divergent interests of employer and employed. Surplus value, or profits, involves world markets, over-production, panics and the final, inevitable stoppage of capitalistic production.

The divergent interests of the two factors in productive in-

dustry, illustrate the law of social evolution as a series of class struggles, and yields the great class struggle of the present, by means of which the world's workers will be educated to the task of carrying the evolution in industry from its present status as collective production for private profit, into collective production for social need.

It is impossible to convey briefly any conception of the synthesis the Socialist doctrine reveals between the great facts and laws it discusses under the phrases "industrial evolution," "class consciousness," "class struggle" and "material interests." Suffice it to say that they constitute a whole which appealed to me as the very life of an immanent God revealing Himself and fulfilling before our eyes and in our hearts the transfiguring processes of evolutionary beatitude.

To feel oneself a part of labor's world-wide solidarity, was to be a conscious part of the divine dynamics by which the inherent potency of unity, good will and opportunity for all were to be realized at last among men.

With feelings and convictions such as these increasing daily as further study, observation of events and association with comrades enlarged my comprehension of the Socialist viewpoint, how does it happen that I am content to be out of the active propaganda? I still speak frequently for the "Local" of which I am a member. I still help as I can, financially, to keep other workers in the field. I write when I can for the Socialist press. But my bread and butter comes from another source and by far the major part of my energy must be given to using my pen upon matters which seem to me of decidedly secondary importance. The reason why I am content in this situation is rooted in the Socialist outlook. Sacrifice and martyrdom is not encouraged among us. Socialism must come primarily through economic necessity on the one hand and the intelligent self-interest of the working class on the other. To be normal, propaganda must be a part of these movements. Economic conditions turn adrift many wage slaves, both "intellectuals" and black-listed manual laborers. These are the natural material out of which Socialist agitators are produced. If they teach a clear brand of Socialism, and teach it effectively, so that it is easy to support them, they are welcomed to the ranks of Socialist workers. If their Socialism is hazy, "half-baked" or idealistic, the fact that they have made sacrifices for the cause, however heroic and honorable such sacrifice may have been, counts very little, so far as smoothing the path for Socialist propaganda is concerned. On the other hand no one is encouraged to give up a feasible livelihood for the work. There are more fine lecturers and organizers in the field than the movement can well support, and whoever can win or retain a "job" not utterly treasonous to the cause, is encouraged to do so.

It is not as if we believed that agitation was the primary causal agency for the approaching revolution. Economic forces must and will lead, and the human energy most directly part and parcel of these forces is that most to be depended upon. Therefore the propagandist who is forced into the movement by economic necessity as well as convictions, is an especially fitting instrument for the interpretation of conditions.

This sense of society as a process and organic movement is the key to most socialist ideas and especially discourages any artificial, inordinate individual efforts. Not only did this view cause me to welcome an offer to become editorial writer on a large daily paper, but it makes me appreciative of that work in its opportunities, even though direct political Socialism is tabooed. The journal for which I write is an exponent of radical Democracy with strong Public Ownership leanings. I can arraign existing conditions to almost any extent and urge "public ownership of public utilities," to any limit, even mildly suggesting public ownership of the Trusts. But, strange as it may seem, to those who regard these things as the essence of Socialism, these are not opportunities that I especially value. To arraign existing evils without pointing out the principles at fault and the remedy therefor; to help enlarge public capitalism from which the laborer will receive no appreciable benefit—these things do not appeal to the Socialist. Nothing is a part of his distinctive work but such efforts as have directly in view the employment of the last man and the elimination of all exploitation from his labor product.

No "reform" efforts can do either of these things, hence reform work will forever leave a wretched army of the unemployed and the terrible maladjustment of the surplus product. Only the complete cessation of rent, interest and profit (labor's surplus product) will solve the problem of the downmost man or the problem of world-production without panic and chaos.

Nevertheless, ceaseless arraignment may stimulate some persons to think out or to search out their own solutions, especially if the finger is placed discriminatingly as near the actual sore as possible; and Public Ownership is so entirely the common sense procedure of even a capitalistic civic order, that I find it easy and not distasteful to urge it in season and out, but never, for a moment, conveying the impression (if I can help it) that it will solve any important economic problem. I especially relish writing editorials showing (to timid readers) how far removed is public ownership of public utilities from Socialism—something I can do with all my heart and bring out some important truths in the process.

Fortunately my socialism was notorious before I was given my present position and I am not expected to write in opposition to my convictions. During a campaign I revel in attacks upon

the Republican party and principles, while leaving to others all boosting for the party of the paper's allegiance. The blue pencil of the managing editor is always alert for my documents, but it is not often used now that I have learned where to draw the line.

The opportunities I value most are in two directions, ethical and sociological. The "leader" on Sunday is always a sermon as "preachy" as I can make it and as permeated as I choose with whatever spiritual and intellectual message I have to give. This supplies the old pulpit opportunity, only with a congregation that a circulation of nearly 100,000 gives, instead of a few hundred physical hearers. There was a time when this would have seemed inexpressibly gratifying; I should have felt that I was using the fulcrum which would move the world. To-day I know that this is not the case. Moral ideals and spiritual uplifts are blessed luxuries for such as may give them room and in some measure realize them in their lives, but they put no bread in hungry mouths; they soften scarcely a whit the cruel grip of the system upon capitalist hearts; they make little appeal to the millions overworked and exhausted; they can only in rare cases free the dependent wage slave from servility and the many pits of mental, moral and physical prostitution in which thousands upon thousands are engulfed. "When men are better, systems will improve." If I still believed this, I should exult in my pulpit of printer's ink. But on the contrary and to my even greater satisfaction, I now see that economic conditions must be the source of the general moral uplift rather than the feeble sermonizing of individuals.

The God of this old world is bringing to pass mighty culminations by world-wide processes. Socialism is coming, not because men are to become so in love with brotherhood that they will demand a Utopian readjustment, but because the good old laws of self-preservation and the struggle for existence are creating a new social order as they have heretofore brought about new biological species, industrial systems and political epochs. The intelligent self-interest of capitalism has brought world production and a world market, an educated proletariat and an industrial organization ready for collective operation. It will soon bring about, also, the clogged, over-supplied world market, which is the logical and actual winding up of an impossible system of production—capitalism.

"Civilization must solve the problem of distribution or it will go to pieces," has been reiterated by economists for many years. Socialism, or distribution with rent, interest and profit eliminated, is the only solution, since this alone allows no surplus to clog the wheels of production. Capitalism is valiantly leading the world to its own doom.

Meanwhile, countless forces are educating the workers of the

world to a sense of solidarity based on intelligent collective self-interest, such as will prepare them to assert themselves when any crisis comes—if not before.

There is nothing Utopian about this. Ideals are not the dynamics of the movement. But to one who has faith in an immanent God, it is a magnificent drama to watch, an awesome and glorious process of which to be a part.

So, while I still love to preach on paper or in pulpit, I can no longer feel that such work is as fundamental as I once thought it. The art of gracious, bountiful living is the most beautiful art. To teach its principles is a privilege; but for the fulcrum upon which the world is being lifted, one must look to something more universal, more potent in cosmic impulse, nearer to the ultimate creative life. Only material interests and industrial forces are sufficiently world-wide to answer such a purpose.

Believing this, the best work I can do aside from the direct interpretation of the Socialist gospel, to fellow workers, is to give to my readers some conception of this world process in its almost infinite ramifications. More than I value the pulpit place I hold, I delight in the opportunity to put passing events in the perspective of the great Marxian laws: to show the fallacy of the President's charming theory of a moral basis for a good nation; to show the economic forces operating on the international political chess board; to trace the laws which must operate before the problem can be solved. All this I can do without meeting often the "blue pencil," and to give, from countless angles, the "Socialist *Weltanschauung*" to a few thoughtful people at least, seems to me to be a great privilege, and a privilege especially to be appreciated when it comes as a part of the work by which I earn my living as a "wage slave."

Long before I die I confidently expect a crisis to arise which will force me again into a Socialist activity inconsistent with capitalistic employment. I shall welcome the call when it comes, gladly. In the meantime it is enough to keep the pulse throbbing just to be one of the uncounted international hosts of labor upon whose shoulders rest the responsibility for ushering in a civilization of free men, women and children—free personally, religiously, politically and, most important of all—industrially.

ANONYMOUS.

The Industrial Convention.

THE delegates who assembled in Chicago last month in response to the call for the Industrial Convention were as representative a proletarian gathering as ever met in this or any other country. The task that awaited them was as difficult, all things considered, as any that ever confronted a body of workers, but they were equal to it and as the result of their deliberations and actions there is now a sound economic working-class organization in the field; and although its progress will be beset with difficulties, it will sturdily face and successfully overcome them all and fulfill the great mission for which it has been organized.

From the very first the capitalist papers misrepresented and in fact deliberately lied about the convention. I have it upon good authority that all the Chicago dailies united in instructing their reporters to "knock" the convention wherever possible and in other respects to ignore it. They did even worse than this, in that they resorted to downright mendacity to accomplish their purpose of defeating a body of men who by their records had proved that they were above the corrupting influences of capitalist bribery and whose object it was to unite the working class for their emancipation from wage-slavery.

These capitalist organs are all very loyal to the American Federation of Labor for reasons that readily suggest themselves.

To show how the capitalist press treated us it is only necessary to say that at their own solicitation I furnished a statement in regard to the convention and its objects. All the Chicago papers were supplied with a copy of it and *all of them suppressed it*. Not a single line appeared, although the statement was furnished at their own solicitation. Next, they sent reporters accompanied by shorthand writers to interview me in regard to the convention and the work it was expected to accomplish. I took the time to dictate an extended and detailed statement. *Not a single line appeared*. Then again, when I was obliged to leave the convention before adjournment to fill some speaking engagements, these same papers reported that I had left in disgust, which was an unqualified falsehood.

The work of the convention, on the whole, was and is entirely satisfactory to me. It was in point of fact, in many respects, the greatest labor convention I ever attended.

The delegates differed widely in matters of detail, which was

to be expected, but upon the great vital principle of uniting the working class upon the economic field in a revolutionary organization recognizing and expressing the class struggle they were one, and the record they made for themselves and their class was in every respect creditable to both their heads and their hearts and will bear the severest tests of time.

Of course, there is no disposition on our part to avoid criticism. We expect it and are prepared to meet it. We have taken our stand and all the capitalist class and their cohorts of whatever name cannot dislodge us.

The predictions so freely made before the convention that Debs was seeking an office and that DeLeon would show his fine Italian hand were all designed to discredit the convention, and the fact that neither the one nor the other of these "self-seekers" holds office in the new organization forces these critics to find other reasons for opposing industrial organization in the interest of the working class.

DeLeon did not "capture" the organization and Debs is not "disgusted" with it. Such silly and stupid falsehoods will have no effect on the body of men and women who met in Chicago on June 27th, and who performed their task with such ability and such fidelity to the working class that the organization formed by them, so much needed at this time, will at once appeal to the workers of the land and they will rally to its standard in ever-increasing numbers until it becomes the dominant power on the economic field in the working class struggle for emancipation.

EUGENE V. DEBS.

State Socialism and Social Democracy.

A FEW days ago one of the oldest and most active members of the S. D. F. opened an interesting discussion at that home of interesting discussions, the Central Branch of our organization, upon the question whether we should repudiate the designation of State Socialists. He was in favor of our not doing so. His reasons, briefly, were that we are constantly appealing to the State, as the organized force of the whole nation, to remedy evils engendered by our economic system. When we are calling upon the State to feed the children, to organize the labor of the unemployed, to provide better education for all, to distribute our letters and telegrams cheaply and effectively, to take control of our railroads, to set on foot a thorough scheme for the housing of the people, etc., it is a contradiction in terms to say that we are not in favor of State action, and that therefore it weakens our position to disclaim being State Socialists. Furthermore, we run no risk by accepting that designation. For what, after all, is the State? The State is the representative of the whole people, as distinguished from the various sections into which it is divided. It holds the balance between any conflicting interests; or, if it does not, this is its proper duty, and we ought not to assume it will decline to accept and fulfil this great trust. We have to look to the State as a collectivity to restrain tendencies to anarchy and to organize the forces of the nation for the increasing advantage of all. This idea of the State has been accepted by many great men in ancient and modern times, and the Greeks more particularly understood the function of the State as the ordering power of the entire people. The State, in fact, is what we choose to make it, and there is no inherent antagonism between the State and democracy. Therefore, Social-Democrats need not be squeamish about being called State Socialists. Such was the argument.

Now it is worth while to deal seriously with points of this sort when they are raised. Socialism is no cut-and-dried collection of dogmas, which are to be taken without investigation. If each successive generation of Socialists considers itself bound to argue out over again all the bed-rock principles of their creed, so much the better. The process will, as we believe, give them only a firmer grip of their entire soundness. And this of State Socialism and State Socialists is not a mere question of words.

Much lies behind it, both in the abstract and in the concrete, in theory and in practice.

To begin with practice. No Social-Democrat who works for the attainment of our "stepping-stones" through the State, regards those palliatives of existing capitalist anarchy as anything more than temporary ameliorations of unendurable conditions. The State is used for this purpose, not because we admire or even tolerate the State, but because, with all its innumerable drawbacks, it is the only machinery available for such partial improvement. We have no illusions whatever in the matter. We know and have frequently pointed out that if we realized them all as set forth above, they would, except in so far as they helped forward the breakdown of the whole capitalist system, and therefore of the State, merely furnish forth better wage-slaves and better organization for the profit-takers. That is indisputable. State departments maintain competition wage-earning and the whole of the forms of wage-slavery. Even if State employes are well-paid, and are assured of continuous employment, they are still only privileged menials, so long as they are unable conjointly with their fellows to control the entire management of the industrial community. State control of this sort may be better or it may be worse than private control, but brings with it no complete change from competition to co-operation such as we are striving for.

Moreover, there is an ever-present danger of fostering Cæsarism and crystalizing a bureaucracy, and the admission that we Democratic Socialists can be in any sense State-Socialists cannot fail greatly to increase this danger. Words still count largely in the formation of ideas. If we, as Social-Democrats, do not force into men's minds the truth that we are working and fighting for a complete social revolution, which shall abolish the present State and establish a Society in its place, we mislead our readers and hearers, and induce them to think we, too, are merely tinkers with present forms of social development. That in itself is a great practical drawback to our allowing it to be thought for a moment that we are in any sense State-Socialists, or men and women who look to the State as a definite entity through which, without entire transformation, we can achieve our ultimate ends. The State means to the infinite majority of people a government dependent nominally upon the people, but imposing its authority from above. But that is precisely what we are endeavoring to overturn. To permit ourselves to be called State-Socialists without demur is to convey a false impression to the public mind. And all false impressions cause confusion and delay, and hamper the cause to which we have devoted ourselves.

So much for the practical and the concrete. Now for the abstract and the theoretical. We English, as a people, are terribly behindhand in all that relates to abstract thought or theo-

retical investigation. Yet it is impossible in many cases to arrive at the truth by direct concrete illustration that has no theoretical basis. Now the State, or the Civitas, as opposed to the Community, or the Societas, has always been based upon property and class interest and privilege, as opposed to kinship and common enjoyment and social equality. State rule always has meant class rule, and has involved a whole series of class antagonisms, at present in course of simplification into one great and final antagonism. The ordering of a State is through departments dominated by bureaucrats, who therefore dominate the people. The arrangement of a Society or a Co-operative Commonwealth is by a series of citizens dominated by the community, who act as functions of the society, not as controllers of the society. Private property in the powers of producing and distributing wealth having been abrogated, the State, in any intelligible sense, ceases to exist. It is no longer, that is to say, a State constituted to restrain and "hold the balance" between conflicting interests; but a co-operative Social-Democracy; instituted to produce and distribute, and to increase the general health, wealth and enjoyment by common consent for the advantage of all. There is then no State to handle and control, as the trusts virtually handle and control it in the nominal democracy of America, or as the aristocracy and plutocracy virtually handle and control it in the nominal democracy of the United Kingdom.

During the transition period, no doubt, we shall try, as we are trying to-day, to use the State against both landlords and capitalists; but we shall do so with the deliberate intention of putting an end to the State, just as we shall abolish Capital, altogether. Consequently, we are no more State-Socialists than we are Capital-Socialists. We recognize that the State and Capital are inevitable stages in social evolution, which will endure a longer or shorter time as circumstances or experience may determine. But both will have to go. So I, for one, refuse to let myself be called a State-Socialist when I am doing my best to sweep away the State.

H. M. HYNDMAN.

(From "Justice.")

Evolution of the Theory of Evolution.

(Continued.)

IN ONE respect, however, Hegel stands entirely by himself as an idealist philosopher. His is the unique distinction of having elaborated idealism into a complete system of monism, by making his absolute idea the lock and key of all science and philosophy, and thus interpreting the world and its phenomena from a uniform point of view. It was this monist principle which enabled him to trace the course of history as an evolution and make a dialectic (evolutionary) method of investigation and description familiar to scientists.

It was also his monism which compelled him to take issue with Kant's metaphysical conception of "the thing itself." This metaphysical absurdity did not fit into the frame work of Hegel's monistic system. For the absolute idea was the only all-pervading reality in this system, and everything that appeared in the world was but the work of this idea. In the human mind, the absolute idea became self-conscious. It is evident, therefore, that the idea must know and understand its own nature and that of its emanations, including Kant's unknowable thing itself. And since the human mind was part and parcel of the absolute idea, it, too, must partake of this absolute faculty of understanding and must be able to learn all there is to the thing itself. Now, things reveal their nature by their qualities. Therefore, if all the qualities of a thing were known to us, we should know all that we could ever learn about the thing itself, including the fact that it existed outside of our faculty of thought. But since all things outside of us, and we ourselves, are but different expressions of the absolute idea, there can be nothing in the world that will remain unknowable to us.

Thinking and being were thus monistically united. But thinking was the only reality in Hegel's philosophy, and being merely an attribute of thought. So the idealist monism of this thinker came to this insoluble contradiction: It tried to prove the reality of the absolute idea by the identity of thinking and being, but the only reliable means by which it could accomplish this was the use of "pure" thought. It had to reject all empirical methods, and rely solely on the power of so-called innate (*a priori*) ideas for the solution of the world's riddles. But innate ideas can operate only with purely introspective philosophy for the solution

of all scientific problems. This, however, was contrary to the dialectic (evolutionary) method of research, which compelled Hegel to collect the experienced facts of history. In fact, he diligently followed the thread of evolution in all fields of science known in his day, and an objective comparison would clearly show that even the so-called great apostle of evolution, Herbert Spencer, walked but in the steps of this encyclopedic idealist monist.

Hegel's dialectic was thus perpetually at war with his system. This was the fatal flaw in his monism. The real and the unreal can never be combined into a system, any more than the something and nothing. The something is real, the nothing is—nothing, is unreal. Being and thinking can be combined only by accepting them as realities. The term "nothing" expresses merely the abstract opposite of an imaginary absolute something. It exists only in thought, it is "pure" thought, which means that it is human imagination misled by false logic. And if this abstract nothing is used as a basis for a system of philosophy, it leads to nothing, in other words, it leaves the human understanding in the wilderness without a guide.

So far as the Hegelian system is concerned, it tells us, therefore, nothing about man, life and their origins, which would improve in any way the work of the ancient Grecian philosophers, the English materialists and the natural philosophers of the 19th century, such as Treviranus and Lamarck, or which would even indicate the progress made by these men. Nor does it explain the hidden springs of the human faculty of thought. Even a metaphysical thinker like Leibniz, who tried as hard as Spinoza to find a monistic clue to the world, had given a better foundation for the study of this faculty by suggesting that so-called innate ideas might be acquired by the hereditary transmission of ideas derived from experienced perceptions. And those who went back to Kant for an improvement of the Hegelian system, for instance Schopenhauer, landed logically in the swamp of reactionary obscurantism. With all its undeniable brilliancy, Hegelian idealist monism was, therefore, a step away from a scientific understanding of the world.

Not so the Hegelian dialectic. This method developed all the hidden value of the Kantian philosophy. And when the Hegelian system failed, the dialectic survived and prepared, with the downfall of idealist monism, the ascendancy and victory of materialistic monism. It is the evolutionary thread, which runs through all of Hegel's writings, that renders a study of his works beneficial for the socialist thinker, who has learned to cull the evolutionary kernel from the idealist husks.

The immediate result of the critical study of Hegelian philosophy in Germany was a fight of the Young-Hegelians against

the system of their master. Among these progressive thinkers, the most decisive contribution toward materialist monism was to come from Friedrich Koeppen, Bruno Bauer, Ludwig Feuerbach, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

The strength of Koeppen lay in his understanding of history. The study of the official writers of Prussia had opened his eyes to the unreliability of the academic historians, whose sole sources of information were diplomatic documents and police reports. He made himself conspicuous by a very clever and clear description of the reign of terror in the French revolution, by which he demonstrated his faculty of selecting the most significant and characteristic factors out of a multitude of garbled and intentionally colored traditions. And he distinguished himself favorably from the mass of the Young-Hegelians by admitting the value of the materialists of the 18th century, although he objected to the "crude materialism" of a Holbach and Helvetius. Koeppen never divested himself fully of the bourgeois psychology, but his historical talent proved to be invaluable to Karl Marx, who was destined to become the first scientific spokesman of the proletarian revolution.

With the development of the German bourgeoisie, and its repression by the feudal nobility, the thinkers of the rising classes felt the need of finding a philosophical expression for their historical condition. In the minds of Bruno Bauer, Koeppen and Marx, this longing for self-expression found vent in a study of self-consciousness. Their starting point was Hegel's analysis of the Grecian philosophy of consciousness, particularly the development of self-consciousness in its relation to social consciousness, in the Sceptics, Epicureans and Stoics. In the Sceptics, self-consciousness had renounced all contact with the world and retreated into itself. The Epicureans had undertaken to show that the principle of individual consciousness was the compelling motive of the universe. The Stoics, finally, had emphasized the interrelation of individual consciousness with universal consciousness. Hegel had given a philosophically obscure and historically weak presentation of these three schools of Grecian thought, and the idealist nature of his system had impregnated his statements with a good deal of reactionary sentiment. It was natural that his revolutionary disciples should take particular offense at this part of Hegelian philosophy and test its soundness by probing deeper into the problem of Grecian self-consciousness and social consciousness.

The result of their studies was a peculiar contribution on the part of each one of these three Young-Hegelians to the problem of consciousness. Koeppen illustrated the significance of the three above-named Grecian schools by the concrete example of Frederick the Great. Bruno Bauer was led from the study of

these three Grecian schools to a study of their influence on the development of primitive Christian consciousness in the Graeco-Roman world. This research bore fruit in the shape of a destructive criticism of the historical value of the four gospels. Bauer struck orthodox theology to the heart by denying that the gospel accounts were based on historical facts and demonstrating conclusively that Christianity arose in the Roman empire as a product of Grecian philosophy and Roman conditions. But neither Koepen nor Bauer were able to exert a pregnant influence on the political conditions of their country by means of practical conclusions drawn from their studies.

Marx, on the other hand, probed deeper than his two companions and became an epoch-making historical figure. He first of all set out on a searching analysis of the three significant Grecian schools of thought and studied their connection with the entire Grecian philosophy. He graduated at the University of Berlin with a dissertation on the difference between the philosophy of Democritus and Epicurus. And he came to the conclusion that his purpose could not consist in anything else but in stating religious and political questions in their self-conscious human form. Religion was the all-absorbing topic in those days of political oppression, and a critique of religion an indirect way of combatting all political reaction. Marx was intimately familiar with the works of Kant and Hegel, and went into a minute study of their proofs for the existence of a God. The comical contradictions in those proofs wrung from him the amused exclamation: "What sort of clients are those, whom their own lawyer cannot save from execution in any other way than by killing them himself?"

It is out of such considerations as these that Marx felt justified in declaring that religion "is the self-consciousness of a human being that has either not yet found itself or again lost itself. * * * Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creatures, the mind of a heartless world, the spirit of spiritless conditions. It is the opium of the people. * * * The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people signifies their demand for real happiness. * * * The world has long been dreaming of things and has but to become conscious of them in order to possess them. * * * Just as religion is the index of the theoretical struggles of mankind, so the political state is that of its practical struggles. * * *

The theological opponents of Marx are fond of quoting the first part of these statements in order to prove that "socialism is the enemy of religion," but they are careful to omit the other quotations, which demand that the professed principles of religion should be applied in every day human life.

The religious criticisms of the Young-Hegelians were

crowned by Ludwig Feuerbach's "Essence of Christianity" and "Theses for a Reform of Philosophy," by means of which he emancipated himself and his fellow-radicals from the Hegelian system. He declared point blank: The mystery of God's nature illustrates nothing else but the mystery of human nature. The various proofs for the existence of a God are merely interesting attempts of self-affirmation on the part of the human being. The method of speculative philosophy, which attempts to deduct concrete truths from abstract generalizations, is fallacious. Nothing can be obtained in this manner but a realization of one's own abstractions. The mystery of speculative philosophy finds its logical champion in theology. Hegelian philosophy is the last resort of theology. Whoever does not abandon Hegelian philosophy, does not abandon theology. Being is the true reality, and thinking merely an attribute of being. Being is simply the existence of nature. Empirical philosophy and natural science must go hand in hand.

Theoretically, Feuerbach had thus overcome Hegelian idealism and become a materialist philosopher. But when it came to a practical application of his new understanding to social problems, he balked at the logical progress implied by his advance over Hegel and fell into meaningless ethical generalizations of love. On the field, Hegel himself had gone farther than his revolutionary disciple. Feuerbach overcame the natural and religious idealism of Hegel, but failed to even suspect the meaning of the Hegelian philosophy of state and law. When confronted with the actual problems of social evolution, he was as helpless as the French socialists of the 18th century, who were masters of philosophic criticism, but had nothing constructive to offer save Utopian abstractions.

Marx, on his part, had arrived at an understanding of the deep and significant interrelation between politics and philosophy. In Kant's philosophy, Marx recognized the German theory of the French revolution. And with a fine sense of discrimination, he pointed out the real progress of Hegel over Kant in sociology and history. While Kant had still maintained the distinction between privileged *citizens* of the state and unprivileged *members* of society, Hegel regarded the state as that great organism, in which every human being should realize its legal, moral and political liberty. And the dialectical process, as outlined by Hegel, was praised by Marx as a wonderful advance over the historical blindness of Kant.

Marx, under these circumstances, did not stop at the point where Bauer and Feuerbach had rested in their advance. He pushed ahead without them, and was gradually compelled, by the exigencies of the political situation, to combat them. In the endeavor to better understand the relation of philosophy to pol-

itics, he first undertook to submit the Hegelian legal philosophy to his scrutiny, with a view of determining the relation of political freedom to human freedom. He opened his critique with these words: "The criticism of religion ended with the statement that man is for man the highest being. This is equivalent to the categorical imperative to abolish all conditions in which man is a degraded, oppressed, forsaken, despicable being." This requires a political revolution. What are the conditions under which such a revolution can take place? In analyzing this problem, Marx discovered that the conditions for such a revolution had not yet matured in Germany. But at the same time, he answered the question in such a way that it was solved for Germans as well as for all other nationalities.

"In order that the revolution of a nation and the emancipation of a definite class may coincide, in order that one class may be the representative of the entire nation, it is necessary that all shortcomings of society should be concentrated in another class, * * * so that the emancipation of this class may be equivalent to the emancipation of humanity."

This class is the modern proletariat, recruited mainly from the ranks of the disintegrating middle class and the different strata of the precapitalist working class. This proletariat will find its intellectual weapons in philosophy. "Philosophy cannot be realized without the abolition of the proletariat, the proletariat cannot emancipate itself without realizing philosophy."

This philosophical affirmation of the class struggle was followed by a philosophical synopsis of its historical mission. Bauer had declared that the solution of the "Jewish question" was identical with that of the emancipation of mankind from religion. Marx denied this and pointed out that the question of the relation of religion to politics was different from that of political to human freedom. Even with the greatest amount of political freedom possible in a bourgeois republic, the people might still be enthralled in religious superstitions. Political emancipation is not identical with emancipation from religious dualism. Exceptionally, the struggle for political emancipation may coincide with the struggle for emancipation from religion, as it did during a certain period of the French revolution. But so long as the bourgeoisie is the ruling class, this can occur only by antagonizing the conditions of its own existence, and must, therefore, result sooner or later in a rehabilitation of religion.

Marx was incidentally led to a searching criticism of the natural rights doctrine and found that the so-called inalienable human rights were nothing but an expression of bourgeois individuality resting on an advocacy of private property and individualism. "Not until the real individual man discards the abstract citizen of the state and realizes that he, as an individual, in his

actual life, his individual work, his individual relations, is a generic being, not until man has organized his individual powers into social powers, will human emancipation be accomplished."

It was this identical conclusion at which Friedrich Engels had likewise arrived in the meantime, and which he expressed in these words, in a preliminary critique of political economy: "Produce consciously, as human beings, not as separate atoms without any generic consciousness, and you will have overcome all artificial and untenable contradictions!" And with almost the same words as Marx, Engels summed up his conclusions relative to religion by declaring that "man lost in religion his own nature, divested himself of his manhood. Now that religion has lost its hold on the human mind through historical development, man becomes aware of the void in him and of his lack of support. There is no other salvation for him, if he wishes to regain his manhood, than to thoroughly overcome all religious ideas and return sincerely, not to 'God,' but to himself."

Engels, although not on such intimately personal terms with the historically significant Young-Hegelians as Marx, had likewise taken his departure from Hegel's dialectic. He had then studied Bauer's conception of self-consciousness and Feuerbach's humanitarianism, and pushed on beyond them in search of a fuller understanding of the Grecian natural philosophers. He became aware of the great historical value of the ancient natural philosophy. Realizing that it contained much fantastic by-work, he nevertheless understood that it was the forerunner of a scientific theory of evolution. On the other hand, he did not fall into the mistake of those purely empirical scientists, who snubbed Hegel for his idealism and pretended to have explained all unknown phenomena by attributing them to some *force* or to some *substance*.

Thanks to this scientific application of dialectic reasoning, at which Engels and Marx arrived independently of one another, they were spared the mistakes of the other Young-Hegelians and the aimless wanderings of the bourgeois scientists and philosophers after them. It was due to the miserable political conditions of Germany that both of them applied their philosophical minds, not to purely academic studies, but to a deeper penetration of the sociological problems which confronted them. Marx took up the study of the French, Engels that of the English socialists. A comprehensive grasp of history, economics, philosophy and natural science was the result. Marx was the first to bring order out of that tangle of blunders known as political economy. Thanks to him, we have a complete survey of the evolution of economics as a science from Aristotle down to Petty, North, Locke, Hume, Adam Smith, Ricardo and Quesnay.

The central fact, which expressed itself especially on Marx, was that "legal relations and state institutions can neither be

understood of themselves, nor as results of the so-called general development of the human mind, but that they are rooted in those material conditions of life which Hegel, following the example of the English and French of the 18th century, comprises under the name of *bourgeois society*; that, on the other hand, the anatomy of bourgeois society must be sought in political economy." This led him to the logical conclusion that "the mode of production of the material requirements of life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or, what is but a legal expression for the same thing, with the property relations within which they had been at work heretofore. From forms of development of the forces of production, these relations turn into their fetters. Then follows a period of social revolution."

These are the terms in which Marx formulated his conception of history in his introduction to his "Critique of Political Economy," published in 1859. But when he met Engels in 1845 for the purpose of permanent association with him, he had it already worked out in almost the same terms. Engels eagerly assented to this new and startling theory of history, which he had himself approached in his "Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844." Henceforth these two thinkers worked side by side in a fraternal co-operation never equaled before or after them. And as the first emphatic declaration of the fact that from now on philosophy, science and the proletariat were united for the conquest of society, and that no science could be monistic without this combination, they flung the gage of battle into the teeth of the bourgeois world in their "Communist Manifesto," published in 1848. Never before had the theory of social evolution been stated in such consistently monist materialist terms as in that immortal document.

Its fundamental proposition, as summed up later on by Engels, is that "in every history epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind, since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership, has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class-struggles forms a series of evolution in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached, where the exploited and oppressed class, the proletariat, cannot

attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class, the bourgeoisie, without at the same time, and once for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles."

The great problem of philosophy, the relation of thinking and being, was thus stated with regard to the human race in a dialectic and monistic way on a materialist basis. For the first time man understood clearly whence ideal forces come and whither they are tending. Human emancipation appeared no longer as the work of some future inspired savior, but as a historical process, whose trend was known and could be controlled by the conscious action of a historically generated class. As Engels stated later in his "Feuerbach": "The realities of the outer world impress themselves upon the brain of man, reflect themselves there, as feelings, thoughts, impulses, volitions, in short as ideal tendencies, and in this form become ideal forces."

The compelling motive for the ideal aims of the proletariat is the class struggle. The evolution of capitalist production determines the form and trend of this class struggle. And the slogan of the revolutionary proletariat is henceforth no longer "Lord help us!" but "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

In 1848, it was only a small group of proletarians who responded to this cry. The hour for the realization of the proletarian revolution had not yet come. This revolution flared up in a few fitful outbreaks, and then settled down to its logical historical course. But a few far-seeing men welcomed the new message with enthusiasm and devoted themselves to its propagation in the spirit of its authors.

One of the first to realize the importance of the Marxian theories was Ferdinand Lassalle, a German lawyer, who, significantly enough, had also oriented himself first by a study of the Grecian philosophers. He hailed Marx as a "socialist Ricardo and an economist Hegel," and sprang into the political arena of Germany with all the impetuosity of youth, to carry these theories into practice and realize the union between science and the working class. His "Open Letter," written in reply to a request for information to a group of German workmen, led to the organization, on May 23, 1863, at Leipsic, of the "*Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverein*" (General Association of German Workingmen), the nucleus of the International Socialist Party, which is destined to fulfill the mission of the modern proletariat.

When the first proletarian revolts had ended in the supremacy of the capitalist class, and the historical course of capitalist development was fully understood by the proletarian thinkers, they settled down to a careful elaboration of the intellectual weapons of the proletarian advance. The crowning outcome of these labors was that series of writings by Marx and Engels, which became the

scientific fundament of the international party of the working class. The foremost of these works is Marx's "Capital," which revolutionized political economy through his theory of surplus-value, bridged the chasm between economics and politics, gave an outline of the past, present and future development of capitalist production, and thus opened an impassable chasm between bourgeois and proletarian science. Its first volume appeared in July, 1867.

It awakened a loud echo in the breast of a German tanner, who had found the way out of the labyrinth of bourgeois thought independently of Marx and Engels, by self-study. This man was Josef Dietzgen, who wrote to Marx on November 7, 1867: "You have expressed for the first time in a clear, resistless, scientific form what will be from now on the *conscious* tendency of historical development, namely, to subordinate the hitherto blind forces of the process of production to human consciousness."

Dietzgen was a natural philosopher in the true sense of the word. He realized that the Marxian conception of history stated a truth which, in its logical bearing, extended far beyond the sphere of mere social evolution. If the materialist conception of history claimed that material conditions shape human thought, then it was the task of the proletarian thinker to demonstrate, by what means material conditions were converted into human thought. And if this process was a historical evolution, then it developed upon the proletarian thinker to show by what processes the evolution of the universe resulted in the development of the faculty of human thought and how this instrument of understanding did its work.

Dietzgen, therefore, wrote in the above letter to Marx: "The fundament of all science consists in the understanding of the thinking process. Thinking means to develop from the material facts, from the concrete, an abstract generalization. The material fact is an indispensable basis of thought. It must be present, before the essence, the general, or abstract, can be found. The understanding of this fact contains the solution of all scientific riddles."

This was, indeed, the crucial point, without which the materialist conception lacked completeness. Without it, the building of materialist monism would have been imperfect. True, Marx and Engels were able to show by the data of history itself that material conditions have always shaped human thought, which resulted in historical events. Not until Dietzgen had shown that the human mind itself was a product of that greater historical process, of which human history is but a small part, the cosmic process, and that the human faculty of thought produced its thoughts by means of the natural environment, was the historical

materialism of Marx fully explained and the riddle of the universe solved so far as human thought processes were concerned.

This was done for the first time in Dietzgen's "The Nature of Human Brain Work," published in 1869.

With this work, the socialist philosophy completed in bold outlines a consistent materialist monist conception of the world, which was uncompromisingly arrayed against all bourgeois philosophy and science, because it rested for its realization on the proletarian revolution. And the test of its monism is found in the fact that none of the shining lights of bourgeois philosophy and science, with the exception of Alfred Russell Wallace, has since worked his way upward to a frank avowal of the historical connection of the proletariat with such a materialist monist conception of the world. He shall presently see that even the clearest thinkers of the bourgeoisie either denied or ignored this connection, or, if its inevitableness dawned upon them, that they bewailed it as auguring the destruction of all "civilization."

But the proletarian thinkers are calmly going their historical way, just as the proletarian revolution is doing. The socialist philosophy, with the founder of scientific socialism, can afford to adopt the motto of Dante: "*Segui il tuo corso, e lascia dir le genti*"—Follow your course, and let the people talk.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

(*To be Continued.*)

Value and Surplus Value.

(Continued.)

AS was already pointed out in preceding articles, the Marxian theoretical system is one solid structure and cannot be properly understood unless viewed as a whole from foundation-stone to roof-coping. To criticize any of its parts as if it were a complete structure in itself is, therefore, a mistake which must necessarily lead to all sorts of fallacious conclusions; and to accept any one of its parts and reject the others as many of the latter-day critics do, simply betrays ignorance of the parts which are accepted and rejected alike. The Marxian theoretical system must be examined as a whole, and accepted or rejected in its entirety, at least as far as its structural parts are concerned.

It is rather the fashion among Marx critics to treat the Marxian "philosophy" and "economics" as if they had absolutely nothing whatever to do with each other, and to accept one and reject the other according to the critic's fancy. As a matter of fact, however, Marx's "philosophy" is nothing more than a generalization deduced from the study of the economic conditions of the human race during its entire course of historical progress, and his "economics" is merely an application of his general historical theory to the particular economic structure known as the capitalist system.

How Marx came to take up the studies which resulted in the formulation by him of the theoretical system which bears his name, and the course which those studies took, is very illuminating in this respect, and his own account of it given in the preface to his "Critique of Political Economy" is of more than passing interest, and we shall therefore place it before our readers.

In 1842-43, Marx says, he found himself, as editor of the "Rheinische Zeitung," the leading radical paper of the time, embarrassed when he had to take part in discussions concerning so-called material interests, such as forest thefts, subdivision of landed property, free trade, and the like, as his previous studies had been only in the domains of philosophy, history, and jurisprudence. At the same time he had to express an opinion on the French schools of socialism of those days with which he was also unfamiliar. He, therefore took advantage of his publishers' desire to pursue a less aggressive course than his, and retired to his "study-room," there to get the needed information.

"The first work undertaken for the solution of the questions that troubled me," he says, "was a critical revision of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Law;'" the introduction to that work appeared in the "*Deutsch Französische Jahrbücher*," published in Paris in 1844. I was led by my studies to the conclusion that legal relations as well as forms of state could neither be understood by themselves, nor explained by the so-called general progress of the human mind, but that they are rooted in the material conditions of life, which are summed up by Hegel after the fashion of the English and French of the eighteenth century under the name 'civic society;' the anatomy of the civic society is to be sought in political economy. The study of the latter which I had taken up in Paris, I continued at Brussels whither I emigrated on account of an order of expulsion issued by Mr. Guizot. The general conclusions at which I arrived and which, once reached, continued to serve as a leading thread in my studies, may be briefly summed up as follows:"

Here follows the famous passage, already quoted by us in the first article of this series, giving the whole Marxian system in a nut shell, and containing Marx's own formulation of the Materialistic Conception of History.

It is amusing to see the evident surprise of some Marx-critics at the fact that Marx, instead of writing an elaborate treatise on the Materialistic Conception of History, relegated its formulation to a short preface of a purely politico-economic work. As a matter of fact, this is very significant, but not surprising at all. This passage contains an epitome of the whole Marxian system: Historical foundation, economic structure and socialist result. The book itself was to treat the economic structure of the capitalist system exhaustively and in detail. The Socialist conclusions were not elaborated for the reason that Marx did not believe in any Socialism that did not flow directly from an examination of the capitalist system, and therefore had to be merely indicated, leaving it to the reader to deduce his Socialism from the examination of the capitalist system contained in the book itself. If that examination did not lead to Socialism such an elaboration would be either useless or unjustifiable or both. But the historical point of view from which the capitalist system was to be examined had to be formulated, as without a clear understanding of it the examination of the laws governing the capitalist system of production and distribution would remain a book sealed with seven seals. Marx, therefore, formulated his historical theory, and settled down to the examination of the economic structure of our present society and the laws governing its particular course of evolution.

The opinions of Marx as an economist are just as many and as divergent as those of him as a philosopher. Slonimski and other critics think Marx has done absolutely nothing for the science of economics; not only are his theories false but they have not even any historical importance. From this view to that of enthusiastic eulogy the opinions run all the way. He has, of course, been denied originality. He is accused by some critics of being a blind follower of the classical English School of political economy, and particularly of Ricardo, and again that he understood neither that school in general nor Ricardo in particular. We shall not go into that, for the reasons given before, except to say that while many parts of his economic theory had been worked out before him, particularly by the English Classical school, the system as such, the combination of the parts into a systematic structure, the point of view from which the structure was built, as well as the corner-stone of the structure, the theory of surplus value, are all his own. We also wish to say right here that Marx had to construct an economic theory of his own for the reason that his historical point of view placed him in opposition to the reigning classical school which accepted our economic system as "natural," that is to say: independent of historical development in its origin, and final in its application. This offended Marx's better historical understanding, his philosophy. The classical school considering our system eternal, analyzed only the relations of its profits to one another, whereas Marx, because of his peculiar point of view, looked not only into the workings of its parts and their relations to each other, but also into the changes effected by the relations of the different parts of the capitalist system in each of those parts and the changes in the whole system flowing therefrom. In other words, Marx examined the dynamic of the capitalist system as a whole, as well as its statics examined by the classical school. His philosophy which placed him in opposition to the classical English school of political economy, also prevented him from drifting into any so-called psychological theories. The underlying principle of all of these theories, the attempt to explain social phenomena by individual motives is entirely repugnant to his historico-sociological point of view, requiring as that does, that social phenomena should be explained in such a manner as to account for their origin, growth, and decline, something which no psychologico-individualistic motivation of social phenomena can do.

When Marx came to examine the economic structure of our social system, his problem consisted in finding answers to the following questions: What are the sources of wealth of our society, that is, of the means of subsistence and comfort of the indi-

vidual composing it? How and in what manner is it produced: what factors, circumstances and conditions are necessary for its production, preservation and accumulation? How, in what manner, and in accordance with what principles, is it divided among the different groups and individuals composing our society? How does this division affect the relations of the groups and individuals participating in it, and how do these relations, and the social phenomena which they produce, react upon the production and distribution of wealth in this society? What are the resulting laws governing the direction and manner of its general movement? What are the historical limits of this economic organization?

A careful examination of our wealth discloses the remarkable fact that, whereas, it consists, like all wealth, of articles ministering to the wants of the individuals of the society wherein it is produced, of whatever nature or character those wants may be, the amount of that wealth, from our social point of view, does not depend on the amount or number of those articles possessed by the individuals separately or society as a whole; that any individual member of our society may be possessed of great wealth without possessing any appreciable quantity of articles that would or could minister either to his own wants or to those of any other member of our society; that, as a rule, a man's wealth under our social system does not consist of articles which minister to his own wants, but to those of other people, if at all; and, furthermore, that a man's wealth may grow or shrink without any addition to or diminution from the articles or substances of which his wealth is composed.

This is an entirely novel phenomenon historically considered and one showing our wealth to be radically different, and possessed of attributes and qualities entirely unknown, to wealth under former social forms. Besides, these novel attributes and qualities of our wealth are apparently in contravention of the "natural" order of things. At no time prior to our capitalistic era was the subjective relation between a man and his wealth—that is the means of his subsistence and comfort—so entirely severed as it is now. At no time prior to this era did a man and his wealth stand in such absolutely objective, non-sympathetic, relations as they stand now. At no time prior to our era was a man's wealth so thoroughly non-individual, so absolutely dependent on social circumstances, so entirely a matter of social force, as it is under capitalism.

What is the distinctive feature, the distinguishing mark or characteristic of the capitalist system of production and distribution of the means of subsistence and comfort which wrought such changes in the attributes and qualities of wealth and how were those changes brought about?

The distinctive feature of capitalist production, that which gives it its character, is that under this system man does not produce *goods* but *commodities*, that is "wares and merchandise." In other words he does not produce things which he wants to use himself, and because he wants to use them to satisfy some want of his, but things which he does not want to use himself but which can be disposed of by him to others, caring nothing whether and in what manner the others will use them. Instead of producing *goods* for his own use, as people used to do in former days, under other systems of production, he produces *commodities for the market*. Marx, therefore, begins his great investigation of the capitalist mode of production with the following words: "The wealth of those societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails, presents itself as 'an immense accumulation of commodities', its unit being a single commodity. Our investigation must therefore begin with the analysis of the commodity." It is the analysis of the commodity that must furnish us the key to all the peculiarities of character which we have noticed in our wealth under the capitalist system of production showing changes which have placed our wealth in a purely objective relation to man and given it purely social attributes and properties.

The distinctive property, again, of a commodity, that quality of the thing which makes an ordinary good an article of merchandise, is its exchange-value. That is, the fact that in addition to the quality which it possesses of being useful for consumption to the one who wants to use it that way, it has the further quality of being exchangeable, that is it can be useful for the purpose of exchange by one who has no use for it as an article of consumption. The exchange-value of an article therefore, while based on the property of the article of being ultimately useful for consumption, is something entirely different and apart from this use-value and independent of it in its variations. Indeed, the two qualities might be said to be antagonistic as they exclude each other: a thing is exchange-value only to the person who has no use-value in it, and it loses its exchange-value when its use-value asserts itself. It is its exchange-value that makes a thing a commodity, it remains therefore a commodity only as long as it is intended for exchange and loses that character when appropriated for use in consumption. The use-value of a thing is, on the one hand, something inherent in its nature, in the very mode of its existence, and does not depend on the social form of its production; it remains the same use-value no matter how produced. On the other hand, the use-value of a thing is a purely subjective relation between the person who uses it and the thing, and therefore any difference in the use-value of a thing when used

by different persons is purely subjective with those persons. In neither of these aspects does it come within the sphere of political economy, whose object is the explanation of the peculiar phenomena of wealth under the capitalist system of production, phenomena which, as we have seen, are purely social in their nature. Both, the natural attributes of things and the individual uses to which they are being put, have existed long before the capitalist system of production without giving wealth those properties of the capitalist-produced wealth which we have noted above. These qualities are the qualities of the *good*, and these uses are the uses to which the *good* is being put to. They are not the qualities nor the uses of the *commodity*. They do not, therefore, in any way affect the exchange-value of the thing, that attribute which makes out of the simple good the mysterious commodity with all its peculiar faculties. Except that the good is the substratum, the material substance, of the commodity; and use-value is the substratum, the material substance, of exchange-value. Historically, therefore, the good preceded the commodity, and use-value preceded exchange-value.

Marx, says, therefore: "Whatever the social form of wealth may be, use-values always have a substance of their own, independent of that form. One can not tell by the taste of wheat whether it has been raised by a Russian serf, a French peasant, or an English capitalist. Although the subject of social wants, and, therefore, mutually connected in society, use-values do not bear any marks of the relations of social production. Suppose, we have a commodity whose use-value is that of a diamond. We can not tell by looking at the diamond that it is a commodity. When it serves as a use-value, æsthetic or mechanical, on the breast of a harlot or in the hand of a glasscutter, it is a diamond and not a commodity. It is the necessary pre-requisite of a commodity to be a use-value, but it is immaterial to the use-value whether it is a commodity or not. Use-value in this indifference to the nature of its economic destination, i. e. use-value as such, lies outside the sphere of investigation of political economy But it forms the material basis which directly underlies a definite economic relation which we call exchange-value."

Our wealth, then, in those respects in which it is different from the forms of wealth which preceded it, and which distinguish it as capitalistic wealth, is an aggregation of exchange-values. In other words: our wealth, in so far as it is not merely used for consumption, but retains its capitalistic properties, is *capital*, is an aggregation of exchange-values. We have already seen that exchange-value is not something inherent in the thing itself, nor does it depend on some thing inherent in the thing itself as an element or condition of its natural existence. We have also seen

that it bears no subjective relation to the person who uses it as such, that it does not depend on anything he does or omits to do, but is an objective attribute derived from some social relation of the individuals within the society in which it is produced. We must therefore conclude that capital, which is an aggregation of exchange-values, is nothing more than a social relation of individuals, and that its properties, which it can only possess by virtue of its being such an aggregation of exchange-values, are merely the result of the social relations of which it is the expression.

What are the social relations represented by exchange-value, and its composite—capital? What are the properties of exchange-value and capital and the laws governing their existence, and how are they derived from and governed by those social relations? These are according to Marx, the object of political economy, and to their critical examination his life-work is devoted.

Before entering, however, upon this examination we must put before ourselves clearly the problem which confronts us, and define clearly the questions which we are called upon to answer. We have already pointed out some characteristics of our wealth which makes it different from the wealth possessed under any previous social system and which show clearly that our form of wealth is the product of our peculiar social relations. These characteristics are, however, not the only ones which require explanation. A cursory examination even of our economic system will reveal the fact that our value-wealth is full of mysteries which, if considered by themselves, defy all attempts at explanation.

The mystery surrounding the origin of our wealth was already indicated above in showing the peculiar property of our wealth to grow and shrink irrespective of any addition to or diminution from the material substances of which it consists. This mystery deepens the further we go into the examination of the production of wealth in our society, and even more so when we come to consider its distribution. Only some of the more characteristic phenomena which puzzle the inquirer into the nature of the wealth of capitalistic nations need be mentioned here, in order to show the nature of our problem.

While, as we have already stated, the amount of our wealth may grow or diminish irrespective of the growth or diminution of the articles of which it consists, thus showing clearly that our value-wealth is something extrinsic and independent of the nature and uses of those articles, yet there is something in the very independence of value-wealth from its material substance which shows a close connection between them. It is true that this connection is rather in the nature of a hostility, partaking of the antagonism already pointed out between use-value and

exchange-value, but the connection is nevertheless clearly defined and resembles in its character the connection of anti-polarity, to borrow an example from another field of scientific research. It has, namely, been observed that there is a tendency to a constant widening of the difference between the amounts of use-value and exchange-value, between the amounts of our value-wealth and the material substances of which it consists. That it to say, it has been observed that with the increase of the production of goods commodities diminish in value, so that the larger the increase in our "natural" wealth, that is in useful articles which go to make up the stores of our social or value-wealth, the smaller the increase of the latter. In other words the growth of our value-wealth constantly and systematically falls behind the growth of the material substances of which it consists. This shows clearly that while the value of a thing does not depend on its natural qualities or the uses to which it may be put, so that exchange-value is entirely independent of use-value, there is a certain well-defined relation existing in their production, at least. What is that relation?

While this question of our wealth-production is merely mysterious, the questions of its distribution are puzzling and perplexing in the extreme. A cursory survey of our social system will show that there are very many persons in our society who evidently do not produce any wealth and yet have it in considerable quantities. In fact, most of our wealth is found in the possession of persons who have not produced it. Where did they get it? The answer which suggests itself to this query is, that they got it from the persons who did produce it. But then the question arises: How did they get it? They did not take it by force, nor was it given to them for love. How *did* they get it?

Ever since man has kept written records of his doings there have been social classes who have neither toiled nor labored and still managed to live on the fat of the land. But the actions of these people have always been plain and above board. Everybody could see just how they managed it. There was never any mystery as to where their fat came from, nor how they got hold of it. The division of the wealth between those who produced it and those who didn't was done in the light of day and by a very simple process, so that each article produced could be traced into the hands of its ultimate possessor and each article possessed could be traced back to its original source. A child could tell the sources of wealth of an ancient slaveholder or medieval feudal baron. Not so with our non-producing classes. The sources of the wealth of our merchant-princes are shrouded in mystery. An honest merchant is supposed to, and usually does, pay for his wares what they are worth and sells them again for what they

are worth. Where, then, does he get his profit? Two men make a bargain and exchange equal values, for they are honest and would not cheat each other, and yet both make a profit! Where does their profit come from? Some foolish people think that merchants make their profits by buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest. In other words, by cheating or taking advantage of each other. This is evidently a mistake. A merchant may, of course, make an extra profit by taking advantage of his neighbor. In that event his neighbor loses as much as he has made. But the regular profits of the merchant are realized when he buys and sells goods at their fair prices. That is why all hands are making money. Otherwise the capitalists would be preying on each other and one would gain just as much as the other would lose. Wealth would merely circulate among the different members of the class but there would be no net gain. What would the merchant *class* live on? But the capitalist class *does* manage to live and thrive and even accumulate and amass large stores of wealth. Where, then, does the *capitalist class* get it?

Other explanations offered are that the merchant by buying and selling enhances the value of the article sold and that the enhanced value is the merchant's profit; or that the merchant's profit is a reward for services as middle-man between producer and consumer. This last proposition is beside the point for the reason that it is not a question of ethics with which we are concerned, as to whether the merchant deserves what he gets, but a pure question of mechanics: how, and wherefrom, he gets it. Nor does the explanation that the merchant "enhances" the value of an article, that is creates new value, by selling it, answer the question: Where and how did they get it? How is the value of a thing "enhanced" by a mere change of hands? Its natural qualities remain the same. The uses to which it can be put remain the same. Where was this value before the merchant got it? Who produced it, and why did its producer part with it? If a mere change of hands create value, why do some people foolishly toil in the sweat of their brow to produce new articles in order to get value when value can be got by the much easier process of sending the articles already on hand around the circuit? This brings us back to the question: What is exchange-value, and how is it produced or got?

We will see later in the course of these articles how Marx's theory of value and surplus-value answers all these questions and unravels all these mysteries, and that it is the only theory that answers the problem of political economy satisfactorily thus making political economy a real science. We will also see the place of our economic system in the string of economies which

go to make up the history of the human race until now and what its further development must or is likely to lead to. We will see, incidentally, how entirely puerile is the talk of Bernstein and his followers who, not understanding the essence of the Marxian theory of value, and, therefore, overawed by the volume of criticism levelled against it by the very learned economists, attempt to hide behind the contention that this theory is not an essential element of Marx's socialist system. We will see, lastly, how utterly absurd is most of the criticism of these learned critics from Boehm-Bawerck down or up.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)

Does God Know What a Thief Is?

THIS was my dream.

Things were rather slow. Peter had been very busy for quite a spell on account of the Japanese and Russian war. In addition to his regular business there had been times when shades of warriors had appeared by the thousands before him for guidance into their proper sphere in the spirit world. On rush days the Saint did not stop to argue, reason or debate, but as fast as the shades appeared they were railroaded into the doorway that Peter knew to be the right one for them.

But it was different now. There was a lull in the war and business was rather slow with the Saint. He jingled his keys and waited for an opportunity with some hard case to display his accumen just to vary the monotony. At that moment he noticed three shades coming towards him and he instantly prepared for the occasion for he felt the event of his career was now nigh, for he recognized in the spirits John Smith, a good Methodist, Jno. D. Feller, the first billionaire, and Taffy Evans, a thief; —all hailing from the United States of America.

Smith was the first to approach the golden gate, closely followed by the others.

"What can I do for you?" said St. Peter.

"I have tried to live according to the rules," said the spirit of the departed John Smith, "and I therefore think I am entitled to get into heaven."

"Tell me," quoth the Saint, "what you think are the essentials for entrance into this realm of bliss." And John replied:

"I tried to bear all my sufferings with great patience; when I was hungry I lifted up my eyes and praised the Lord; when I suffered from cold I tried to kiss the rod that smote me and always tried to be cheerful and contented with my condition, no matter how hard, and praised His name the oftenest when I suffered the most."

"Did the Lord want that?" asked St. Peter.

"I was told so by his servants," replied John.

"Yet you believe the Lord made you and gave you a desire for things to eat, provided plenty with which to fill your stomach, gave you the power to enjoy them all and nevertheless you trusted other men's stories in preference to what your own body said. Frankly, John, if you did not have sense enough to enjoy the good things on earth, did not have energy enough to reach out

and get them, when every minute of the time your God-made body demanded that you should, you simply are not a fit subject to enjoy higher things. You practically lived in a fool's paradise down below, but we have no paradise for fools here. You can either go back to earth again and learn your little lesson or pass into oblivion, whichever you like. Stand aside and make up your mind what you want to do."

The shade of John Feller seemed highly pleased with the conversation and glided forward.

"Well, what do you want?" said St. Peter.

"Judging by all that you have said to Smith, I am fitted for a front seat in heaven, because I am not in the least indebted to my stomach or my back. Never have they asked for anything but they have got it through my efforts, and having done so well on earth for my body, I feel I could do just as well in heaven for my spirit."

"So far, good," replied the Saint. "But let me first remark that since you have no body to feed or clothe, your material success on earth is of no value in heaven. It is merely an indication of your character. But we have here a vast collection of all kinds of precious stones for educated minds to feast upon, what do you know about them?"

"Frankly, nothing," was the reply. "I was so busy accumulating wealth that I never had time to study the beauties of mineralogy, though I did have aspirations that way. You see I hired practical men to investigate all these things and I got their results in gold. In fact gold is the limit of my knowledge of natural science and I preferred it when coined."

"Well, in every direction you can see millions upon millions of shining stars. What do you know about them?"

"Nothing, in fact I refused to pay the cost of the observatory in connection with my pet University, because I could see no prospect of ultimate profit."

"We have magnificent choirs in heaven," said St. Peter. "What do you know about them?"

Again, "Nothing, I can only tell you what doubtless you well know, every minute of my time was spent in acquiring material things, and much as I frequently desired to study the beauties of nature, I never found time to cultivate my mind in this direction."

"Then," quoth the Saint. "You also are as much indebted to yourself as John Smith, in not having satisfied your natural desires in the plane below. You simply are unfit to enjoy the higher developments here for you lack the necessary qualifications. Heaven is no place for played-out physical wrecks, but like earth a place for the satisfaction of every God-given desire."

So you also must choose whether you return to earth again and learn your proper lesson or pass into oblivion. Stand aside."

"What can I do for you, Taffy?"

Now Taffy was a Thief, and he knew it.

"I suppose the best you can do for me is to send me to hell," said Taffy.

"Why?" said St. Peter.

"Because I was a Thief."

The Saint smiled.

"I believe they do use some such terms as that on earth. Tell me about it."

"Well," said Taffy. "Men like Feller got hold of a vast amount of the good things on earth, said that the Lord gave it to them, and therefore I and a host of others had to do without. I did not see it that way, so when I was hungry I took what I needed, if I could not get it any other way and that is why I am a Thief."

"You are all right, Taffy," said St. Peter. "You are the kind of a fellow God made heaven for. He makes men hungry, he gives them a stomach to enjoy good things, and provides plenty to satisfy their longings. That is the law written in their members and is the revelation he gives to everybody without any intermediary. Any man who does not get his share down below is simply a fool. Step right in and if you are as energetic in getting your share of the good things inside you will be all the better liked."

Taffy started through the golden gate, then he turned back and asked,

"But is there not a hell?"

"Oh, yes," said St. Peter.

"Well, who are in it?"

St. Peter smiled.

"It is inhabited by those who made it of course—the preachers."

DUNDAS TODD.

EDITORIAL

Work That Should Be Done.

Just at the present moment when in most of the states there is no active campaign, and no national election of any sort in immediate prospect, there is an opportunity to do some things that have been neglected and whose accomplishment is of great importance as a foundation for future work.

The last national convention assigned several tasks directly to the national committee. Up to the present the will of the convention in this respect has been almost entirely ignored. There has been much excuse for this. The national committee is cumbrously organized and has not yet found itself. It has had no definite tasks to perform, has not evolved methods of work suited to its character, and as a result has come to be looked upon by many as a sort of useless fifth wheel to the socialist chariot. We do not believe that this opinion is justified. We believe that the national committee can be made a most valuable portion of the socialist party machinery. It stands much closer to the membership than the national executive committee and if it rises to its opportunities and proves itself effective it should be the dominating influence rather than the executive committee.

One of the tasks assigned it by the national convention was the elaboration of a municipal program. There is now urgent need that this work be taken up. At the elections next spring several hundred socialists will in all probability be elected to municipal positions. At least fifty are already in office, and yet up to the present time they have accomplished very little. This is to a large degree due to lack of any comprehensible and intelligent, systematic, unified idea of their opportunities and duties. It should be the work of the national committee to elaborate a practical guide for these men. The report of the special committee as revised by the national convention affords a nucleus on which to work. This is already in the hands of all the members of the national committee. If taken up by them at once and such amendments as thought desirable forwarded to the national office with the understanding that these amend-

ments would not be acted upon until a definite time, when all could be sent out together, the work of revising by correspondence could be reduced to a minimum.

Comments on these amendments should be sent rather to the party press than to the national office. What is needed is the widest possible discussion in order to create as extensive and intelligent an opinion upon these matters as possible.

We have continuously urged in this connection that a permanent municipal committee be elected similar to that now existing in several European countries. Sooner or later the socialist party of America will do this. We believe that the time is now here to begin this work.

Another task which was assigned the national office was the organization of a socialist press bureau to supply "patent insides" or "plate matter" to papers. The national office sent out circulars on this matter but received too few responses to encourage them to proceed further. Nevertheless we believe that if the matter were properly pushed it could still be made a success. It is certain that any deficit which would result would be very much less than the expense of sending out the national bulletin and that if one column each month of this plate matter were devoted to a condensation of the matter which now appears in the monthly bulletin the educational results would be far greater.

There has been very much complaint about the work of the national office on the ground that a highly disproportionate amount of its income was expended in maintaining itself. Indeed it has reached the point where the national machinery seems to be largely in the condition of many country churches—it is spending all its energies to keep itself running. In this connection it has been suggested that the amount of dues going to the national office be reduced from five to two cents. Such a move as this would be most unfortunate as it would cripple the national machinery at times when it is sorely needed. A much better plan would be to follow the practice of many trades unions and arbitrarily apportion the dues coming to the national office to different funds. If two cents a month, for example, were segregated as a propaganda fund to be used only for the purpose of sending out organizers and paying for literature this would compel a better utilization of the money.

The Crestline Resolution.

Sufficient Locals having now endorsed the Crestline resolution it goes to a referendum of the entire membership. We believe that if it is adopted there will be few members who will not agree that it was a mistake before two years have passed by.

The Wisconsin movement is perfectly capable of taking care of itself, and to punish the innocent with the guilty by shutting all off from par-

ticipation in the National Organization until what is now a minority shall have gained the upper hands is a mistake. It can not but tend to arouse faction and bitterness within the state and to disrupt the movement now existing. Such a thing as this would be a calamity. There is no state in the Union that is distributing more sound socialist literature than Wisconsin. In the city of Milwaukee this work has been organized to an extent unknown in any other city. In many wards every house has been reached separately during each campaign. This means that a large body of workers have been drilled and organized. These men are earnest independent workers for socialism and are not responsible for any mistake that a few leaders may have made. To punish them, to undo the work that they have done, to give encouragement to the strong capitalist forces that are allied in that city for the crushing of socialism would be more than a mistake; it would be criminal.

It will show that the socialist party is not yet out of the childish stage during which it is unable to distinguish between discussion and discipline. We should be capable of settling our differences by criticism and discussion rather than by petty persecutions under the name of discipline. It will show that we are utterly lacking in any sense of proportion, if we permit a trifling detail as to form of affiliation to bulk bigger in our eyes than the great work of socialist agitation, education and organization which has been done in Wisconsin.

Such counsel as this we thoroughly realize is not popular, especially at a time when partisanship and personality are dominating so large a portion of the socialist press and party membership. The thing that gains applause now is a demagogic appeal to "smash all compromisers" and this notwithstanding the fact that the sort of smashing tactics that are advocated is very apt to excite sympathy for the compromiser and his doctrines among intelligent people.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The most important developments in the labor world during the past month were a number of far-reaching court decisions against organized labor which indicate that capitalism is insidiously striving, through its political power, to strike at the most vital and unprotected parts in the trade union armor. We have seen how the injunction has become a permanent weapon of oppression and how the damage suit industry has struck root and is growing as a sequence. Now the powers that be, conscious of their position of vantage as a class and always vigilant and loyal to capitalism when it is attacking labor, is pursuing a new tack. The union label has become a source of annoyance to those exploiters who shout loudest for open shop, "freedom of contract," etc., especially so because some of their own class have considered it good business to get ahead of competitors by making agreements with unions, so far as wages, hours and working conditions were concerned, and in return receive the right to use the labels of those organizations, to place upon their products, and thus also be guaranteed a large constituency to advertise and purchase their wares without further cost. Hence the union-busters are hailing with delight the decision that was rendered several weeks ago by the New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals, which reversed the District Court of Newark in fining a cigar manufacturer named Goldberg the sum of \$200 for violating the union label law. The upper court held that section 10 of the label law of New Jersey, which provides a fine of not less than \$200 or more than \$500 for violating the provisions of said law, is unconstitutional. The court declared that the Legislature had no power to enact a law imposing a penalty for the benefit of the plaintiff, the cigarmakers' union, which is being interpreted as a declaration that an unincorporated body cannot bring civil or criminal proceedings against a business concern. It will be readily understood that if the penalty for disobeying the label law is wiped out the statute is dead as a door-nail, and as the label laws in many other states are closely copied after the New Jersey measure this case is of great interest to organized labor the country over. The fight has now been transferred to the State Supreme Court and will be heard in a short time. It is a safe guess that the tobacco trust, which has resorted to every scheme possible to destroy the effectiveness of the cigarmakers' blue label, is in some manner connected with this case. The combine has long sought for an entering wedge to make it possible to peddle its scab-made products, bearing counterfeit labels, in the market, and thus be enabled to swing another club over the heads of independent competitors that recognize union labor.

The open shop organs are highly pleased with the recent decision of

the Massachusetts Supreme Court, in which that body follows in the footsteps of the highest court in Illinois, in declaring the so-called closed shop—or, more properly, the union shop—unlawful. In a previous number of the *Review* I touched upon the progress of the case of Berry versus Donovan, the history of which is briefly as follows: On January 24, 1904, the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union entered into an agreement with Goodrich & Co., shoe manufacturers of Haverhill, Mass., to grant the use of the union label to said firm upon condition that the plant would thereafter be operated as a union establishment. The employees were invited to join the union. Michael T. Berry (who, by the way, is a shining light in the moribund Socialist Labor party) declined to become a member of the union, was discharged and thereupon brought suit against Jerry E. Donovan, business agent of the union, for \$1,500 damages. The lower court decided in favor of the plaintiff, and now the Supreme Court affirms the verdict. In the opinion of the higher court, written by Chief Justice Knowlton, the unions are striving to obtain a monopoly and dominate the industries. "The attempt to force all laborers to combine in unions," says the court, "is against the policy of the law, because it aims at monopoly." Similar views are expressed a number of times by the court, and one of the ablest lawyers in Massachusetts is quoted as saying that "this is the most far-reaching and important decision made in this state in fifty years." The case will be carried to the United States Supreme Court. Of course, if it is contrary to law when ALL laborers are combined, because such a union AIMS at monopoly, then every shop, factory, mine and railway operated by union labor exclusively is an illegal institution. Just how the Massachusetts jurists expect to strike the happy balance between union and non-union workers, and determine what percentage of each should be employed in establishments, we are not informed. We have been assured, however, when the courts wiped out the laws to prohibit blacklisting in recent years, that employers have the right to hire and discharge whomsoever they please; but evidently this is not the case where it happens that an employer believes that it is to his business advantage to hire ALL union workers, and the right only exists where capitalists desire to victimize organized employees. Nor do those wise gentlemen, who are regarded with such great awe by the voting yokels of the old parties, inform us whether employers who hire non-union workers are also committing unlawful acts. What with military and police bullying, injunction oppression and decisions like the foregoing, organized labor will soon be regarded as modern "runaway niggers." It's about time that those trade unionists who have any sense of self-respect give the old Gompers policies a swift kick and line up with the Socialists who will have something to say to the courts when they obtain political control.

Another case that has been watched with considerable interest in organized labor circles is that of the F. R. Patch Manufacturing Co., against the Machinists' Union at Rutland, Vt. It will be recalled that the Patch Co. brought suit against the machinists for \$2,500 damages sustained on account of striking and picketing on the part of employees about two years ago. The case was bitterly contested from the start, but judgment was rendered in favor of the plaintiff. An appeal was taken and now the Supreme Court of Vermont has sustained the lower court and awarded the damages prayed for, together with costs and interest to the Patch concern which will recover about \$3000, and the total cost to the unionists will probably amount to about \$8,000. The plaintiff's attorneys have been busy during the past month attaching the wages, goods, chattels and estates of 23 machinists to satisfy justice, and it is expected that along in September enough money will have been earned

by the men, which, with the property that will be confiscated, to turn over to Patch and close the incident. It is related that one of the members, Charles E. Nourse, tried to save his home by transferring it to his wife through a third person, but Patch moved to set aside the deed. Several others made sacrifices to get out of town and a number who are forced to remain are hit hard by the final settlement. It wouldn't be so bad if, for instance, "Jim" O'Connell, the pure and simple (picket and strike) president of the I. A. of M. were compelled to suffer instead of a lot of poor devils who were compelled to stand upon the firing line and be mowed down by the Patch people entrenched behind their privileges and political power. O'Connell doesn't believe in working class political action, and he and his colleagues had the audacity to defy referendum instructions, at the Boston convention of the A. F. of L., commanding them to vote for Socialism and against Gompers. Just now there is a referendum election on in the national union and O'Connell is being fought hard, the opposition centering about Maurice Landers, of Springfield, Mass., a former vice-president. Of course, the chances favor O'Connell, but the outlook for some of his Federation delegation is pretty dubious. The feeling is very bitter against the administration in many of the large industrial centers and the chances are that the Boston convention of the national union next month will witness some warm sessions. At that it is doubtful whether O'Connell will propose any rational remedy to meet just such critical emergencies as that at Rutland. But the rank and file will enforce some new policies before long—you can gamble on that. There is no organization in the country that is becoming more thoroughly awakened to the methods of capitalism than the International Association of Machinists.

Speaking of damage suits, still another case has been settled to the satisfaction of the open shop fanatics. In Orange, N. J., one Frank Winkler, a hat finisher, won his action against the United Hatters for \$300 damages. Winkler had been suspended from the union for failing to pay his dues and consequently could not be employed in any union shop. His suit was undoubtedly prompted and pushed by the Employers' Association, which wishes to destroy the organization, and is reported to be behind the suits for heavy damages which were begun by the Loew concern of Connecticut against the hatters for boycotting its scab products. Some unionists are still waiting to hear some suggestion in the *American Federationist* or other pure and simple organs how to meet this new and growing danger. But do you imagine that they print a word about any of these damage suit cases? Not a line. One sheet out in the wilds of Indiana announced a couple of weeks ago that it was too busy printing accounts of the great gains made by labor everywhere to pay any attention to such little things as damage suits. And nearly every page of the organ was covered with boiler-plates regarding last year's ice crops, how to behave in society and such slush.

Readers of the *REVIEW* will remember that I mentioned a recent case in New Orleans in which a court handed out damages against a union in favor of two expelled members and ordered their reinstatement. In New York City a court forced a union to do the same thing, and now in Rochester it is announced that Judge Nash granted a mandamus ordering that a musician named Bachman, who had gone wrong, be admitted to the union. The organization's officers and members refused to obey the edict whereupon the same court issued another ukase ordering that the president and secretary be arrested, which was done. They gave \$500 bail and will have to show why they should not be punished for contempt of court. Some of these attacks upon organized labor through one branch of the government would be more or less humorous

if they did not have a very serious side. The craze to drag labor into courts is growing, and every new decision made serves as a precedent to establish custom and usage, law or no law. And with every new burden that is heaped upon the patient back of organized labor, along comes the cheerful idiot and bawls louder than ever, "keep politics out of the union!" But the c. i. is losing his prestige and influence, though it required a long, hard fight and no small amount of sacrifice and suffering. The rank and file are beginning to recognize the fact that while they have been perfectly satisfied to accept the advice of the great leaders (who are followers), yet the capitalists are forcing politics into the unions without as much as asking permission. They "butt in" through courts, legislative bodies and administrative agencies. They won't let us alone as individuals or collective bodies, and for that and other reasons a revolution of thought is sweeping through the organizations that will make some of the old back numbers hump themselves in the not distant future.

One of the surprises in the labor world was the defeat of E. J. Lynch as president of the metal polishers and brassworkers by A. B. Grout at the recent referendum election. Lynch is quite an able fellow and at times was inclined to be truly progressive, but he would hesitate and chase off after the exploded theories of the old school and line up with the Gompers bunch. Grout, on the contrary, is a Socialist, who knows what it means to pit an empty stomach against an employers' association. He was a central figure in the great Chicago strike last year, for which he was blacklisted and had to flee to the woods of Wisconsin to live. I am willing to wager that Grout, in his new position, will strike straight from the shoulder and call a spade a spade, no matter whether he is confronted by an audience of common workmen or great labor leaders. Theodore Shaffer has also been succeeded by P. J. McArdle, of Muncie, Ind., as president of the iron and steel workers. No sooner was that matter settled at the Detroit convention when Shaffer breaks out into a wild, weird song of praise for Carnegie, in which it was recited that the Canny Scot had nothing to do with the Homestead strike and is a real, good man. McArdle can do no worse than his predecessor and he has certainly inherited plenty of trouble. The trust not only beat back the demand for an advance, but forced the union to remove its rule restricting the output, and next year the open shop system is to be enforced in all mills. However, Carnegie may provide a job for Shaffer, now that he has been given a liberal dose of white-wash, to help give away his money.

There is going to be a hot time in the Pittsburg convention of the A. F. of L. on the jurisdiction question, as usual. Besides the old grievances that will be warmed over for the occasion, the little unpleasantness between the longshoremen and seamen, which began in San Francisco last year, has become aggravated. The seamen, who are Republicans and Democrats as a rule, are openly helping to smash the longshoremen, who are also Republicans and Democrats for the most part, out on the Pacific Coast. Now the longshoremen demand that the sailor men be kicked out of the Federation, as they also threaten to scab it on the land lubbers along the lakes. The seamen declare on the other hand, that the longshoremen have broken the laws of the A. F. of L., and they are industrialists who would organize everybody on and along the waterways and wouldn't hesitate to reach into a corn field and grab the man at the plow. Therefore, they should be expelled. Meanwhile Sam Gompers isn't saying a word about this family quarrel among the Republican and Democratic brethren. His winning specialty is smashing *the Socialists*, vide his pronunciamento relative to the Chicago convention to organize the Industrial Workers of the Whole World—and Timbuctoo.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

By far the most striking incident in international politics (aside from events in Russia, with which, however, it may take equal rank) was the refusal of Count Von Buelow to permit Jaures to speak at a peace meeting to be held in Berlin. The most remarkable thing about this was the fact that it was almost if not quite the first time in European diplomacy that an individual was treated exactly as if he were an independent nation. Buelow's note was addressed to Jaures through the German minister at Paris. The text of this note is in itself interesting and we give it herewith:

"BERLIN, July 5, 1905.

"The press has announced the appearance of Mr. Jaures at a social democratic meeting in Berlin for July 9th. I have not the slightest objection to the personality of Mr. Jaures, I value Jaures as a speaker, I honor his views in regard to foreign politics and find myself not infrequently in agreement with him. I rejoice that he has many times stood for friendly relations between Germany and France.

"We are not dealing, however, here with the personal valuation of Mr. Jaures, but with the political role which has been ascribed to him. The leading organ of the social democracy in Germany, *Vorwärts*, has announced that this meeting will be the beginning of a direct influence of social democracy on external politics and of the propagation of the class struggle on international foundations. Even plainer is the irritating position of the German managers of the meeting in an organ of the so-called scientific socialism, the *Neuen Gesellschaft*, which says among other things: 'Revolution has dynamited the Russo-French alliance. Now it is the historical purpose of the German Social Democracy to afford the French Republic what they have sought in vain from the Russian rulers: protection from the provocations and excessive dominations of an imperialistic German policy.'

"In this we are plainly told in what direction the proposed meeting will be lead. The German social democracy will utilize the presence of Mr. Jaures in Berlin to further their hostile efforts against national interests while concealed by his person. The imperial government can not therefore refuse to utilize whatever means are at its disposal to oppose such actions. It would otherwise contribute through its dispensation to the growth of a party which seeks to overthrow the constitutionally established existing order in Germany.

"The government of the French Republic has always maintained its right to forbid speakers the right of speech whenever such refusal appeared desirable. They have at one time refused the German Reichstag members, Bebel and Bueb, from speaking on French ground concerning

their political activity in Germany. In years gone by they have also refused to permit the German Reichstag member, Delsor, from appearing in Luneville. In both cases the French people have endorsed the actions of the French Government. This was especially true in the case of Abbe Delsor. If my memory does not fail me, even the French socialists did not find themselves in opposition to their government on the subject.

"Even if we were certain that the tact of Mr. Jaures would be such that to lead him to avoid anything that might embarrass the German or the French government the same security unfortunately can not be offered for the German representatives at the meeting. Mr. Jaures, scarcely a year ago, in Amsterdam has testified as to how far the German social democrats have gone in their purely negative doctrinarianism and backward position, from the practical and patriotic position of their French comrades in thought.

"I think, therefore, that it is no more than proper that the public presence of Jaures in Berlin be denied. You are instructed to convey the sense of this communication to Mr. Jaures in the most convenient manner and to seek to prevent his journey to Berlin. (Signed) BUELOW."

It is now generally admitted by friends and foes alike that the sending of this letter was about the most foolish thing that Count Von Buelow could have done. Although *Vorwärts* denounces him in unmeasured terms and holds up to ridicule his attempt to pose as the avenger of Bebel, whom the French government refused the right to speak, yet through it all there runs a vein of sarcastic congratulation and we are not surprised to find the article concluded as follows:

"Count Buelow has become the foremost agitator of the social democracy. He compels the most innocent to recognize what a powerful task is laid before the social democracy in the effort to transform the German government now founded on violence and police domination into a government of political culture and freedom."

Someone, we think it was Marx, said: "A new 'power' has been added to the 'great powers' of Europe, the proletarian power of socialism." We believe, however, that this is the first time that this "power" has been recognized in diplomatic intercourse as entitled to rank with the other great powers in Europe.

HOLLAND.

The general election has just been held in Holland. The coalition of all the anti-socialist parties was much closer than ever before and for the first time the socialists made no alliances with any other party. The result of the election is that the socialist vote was increased from 38,270 in 1901 to 65,743 in 1905. Only eight socialists, however, were elected to parliament, but when the failure of the general strike and the activity of the anarchistic movement are considered the election was looked upon with great satisfaction by the socialists.

RUSSIA.

It is almost impossible to obtain any clear idea of what is going on in Russia today. There are a large number of movements, mostly violent and apparently not closely related or carefully organized. Just how long this can continue without a revolutionary movement is impossible to tell. Meanwhile the revolutionary parties remain divided. The social democrats have

"united" into two divisions seemingly more hostile than the various ones that have previously existed. However, Comrade Kautsky in an article in the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* seems to think that this presages an actual unity. Bebel on the other hand considers the situation so serious as to call for a special session of the International Socialist Bureau. Meanwhile the Semstvos are meeting in Moscow in spite of the orders of the Czar and the efforts of the police. They are supposed to be discussing a national constitution, the general features of which are reported to be modelled after the English constitution. The Czar is to retain the control of the army and the right to veto any bills passed by the National Congress which it is proposed to establish. The Congress is to have control of finances and general legislative power.

ARGENTINE.

The following has been received from the International Socialist Bureau:

The Argentine socialist party, which has hitherto been free from any interference on the part of the government, is now confronted by unforeseen difficulties, which must be studied in order to find the most efficient means for their solution.

These difficulties have created a situation full of uncertainty and well-founded apprehension. For this reason we have decided to familiarize you with the circumstances and to ask you whether the steps which we will suggest to you are timely and possible.

The Argentine Republic is essentially an agricultural country. Of our five million inhabitants, scattered over a territory of about three million kilometers forty-two per cent. live in cities and fifty-eight per cent. in the rural districts.

From the economic point of view, a few words will describe our country. It produces cereals, wool and cattle, which are taken to the ports and shipped to Europe. Industrial development, which has reached a certain point in two or three large cities, has not affected the essential character of the country in the least. This characteristic feature of Argentine implies logically an intermittent economic and commercial activity.

In the summer, when the crops are harvested and shipped to Europe, the economical and commercial activity reaches its climax. In the winter, when the work of agriculture is ended, this activity is at its lowest ebb. The demand for laborers is naturally directly dependent on the economic activity of these seasons.

In the summer the laborers easily find employment in the field work. In the winter the majority of them pass their time in the great cities.

From the foregoing it follows that, for the majority of the laborers of Argentine, the only season in which they can demand any improvement is that in which hands are demanded for the harvest, that is to say, in the summer time.

Ever since a small labor organization has existed in our country we have great strikes every year, beginning in the month of November and ending in the month of March. In the first years in which the working class followed this strike tactics during harvest time the capitalist class of Argentine was taken by surprise and had to acquiesce to the demand of the laborers. But when these strikes continued and reached their climax in November, 1902, especially in the capital, the capitalist class quickly brought pressure to bear on the government and at the end of the year had a law passed exiling all strangers who had taken a conspicuous part

in those strikes. And when this did not suffice to break the strike of 1902, the government declared martial law and crushed the movement.

In the beginning of February, 1905, military revolts broke out in different parts of the republic. These were suppressed by the government and the opportunity grasped for the purpose of prolonging martial law for three months more for the avowed purpose of insuring not alone "law and order," but also the gathering and exportation of the crops.

Several strikes which were about to be declared had to be suspended on account of martial law, which is identical in our country with a suppression of all constitutional guarantees.

We have now reached the most important point of our subject. The working class of Argentine fears, not without good reason, that the government will adopt the policy of declaring martial law every year, for the purpose of anticipating the strike movement during harvest time; and if this assumption should prove true, the working class would be in a very difficult position, seeing that its organization is not strong enough at present to exert enough power to overcome the effects of such a measure.

With a view of heading off such a policy, or of preparing eventually a defense on the part of the working class, we have decided to turn to you and ask you to negotiate by means of your socialist parties with the longshoremens of the principal ports of England, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany and Italy and to ascertain whether they would not be disposed to boycott all steamers coming from Argentine in case the government of our country should declare martial law or undertake to decree arbitrary measures against the strike movement, which our class inaugurates every year as a weapon of the class struggle during harvest time. Mark well that the boycott should extend only to steamers carrying a cargo of harvest products, that is to say, it would be in force for a definite period of the year (from January to April).

We hope, comrades, that you will give us all the support necessary under these trying circumstances. If the longshoremens of the ports mentioned are willing to perform this beautiful act of solidarity, which we are asking of them, be so kind as to let us know as soon as possible.

Buenos Ayres, April, 1905.

ALEJANDRO MANTECONHIJO,

General Secretary.

BOOK REVIEWS

FREEMAN OR SLAVE, by Fred D. Warren. *Appeal to Reason, Girard, Kansas. Paper, 64 pp. 10 cents.*

This is a handy little compilation of the matter contained in the 18th National Report of the Commissioner of Labor which has been practically suppressed within six months after its first appearance. It is one of the sort of books that every working socialist ought to carry around in his pocket to use when facts are called for to back up any position.

HOW TO KNOW THE STARRY HEAVENS, by Edward Irving. *Frederick A. Stokes Co. Cloth, 313 pp. \$2.00.*

The author announces that: "This volume is not so much a text book on astronomy as an invitation to read books on that subject." It would be presumptuous on our part to attempt to give a technical opinion on the scientific side of this work. However, we have been assured by some persons who are supposed to know, that it represents the latest and most authoritative positions in astronomy. We can testify, however, that it is most interestingly written with striking illustrations and not a little humor, things which readers seldom look for in works on astronomy. Throughout the work astronomy is related to other sciences and to general facts of knowledge in a way that emphasizes once more the old truth of the unity of all truth. Numerous colored illustrations, charts and reproductions of photographs add to the interest and assist in comprehending the text.

WOMEN IN THE PRINTING TRADES, by J. Ramsay McDonald. *P. S. King & Son, London. Cloth, 206 pp.*

This is one of those detailed studies and compilations of facts such as we usually associate with government enterprise. It shows that women have entered into a great variety of trades and discusses the conditions under which they work. The totals show that in the several industries studied, which are quite comprehensive, embracing most of the manufacturing factory trades, there were 68,318 women employed in 1895 and 76,203 in 1897 showing that the increase in female labor still continues. In considering "Women's Work and Organization," only the printing trade is treated and it is pointed out that here organization has been very weak and ineffective, and some general conclusions are drawn as to women and trades' unions that seem scarcely justified from this one trade, especially as the experience in other lines would show that women are capable of effective organization. Other chapters compare "Men and Women as Workers," or treat of "Industrial Training," "Legislation," "Women and Machinery," "Home Work," "Married and Unmarried" and "Wages." As a compilation of facts the work is very satisfactory and will save the student of this subject much weary search through less accessible documents. We are rather surprised however that the socialist author is so careful to avoid all conclusions.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

GERMS OF MIND IN PLANTS.

This recent illustrated work by R. H. France, translated by A. M. Simons, will be ready for delivery by the time this issue of the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* is in the hands of its readers. It is the second volume of the *Library of Science for the Workers*, of which the opening volume, "The Evolution of Man," has scored so prompt and complete a success.

"Germes of Mind in Plants" is no less interesting and important. The author's central thought is that a careful and sympathetic study of plant life shows forces operating in the plants which correspond closely to some of the operations of the human mind. This is brought out not in an abstract and theoretical fashion, but by means of graphic descriptions of the actions of particular plants, showing how each one responds to impressions from the outside, and acts on those impressions in ways that will benefit itself.

The conclusion from these facts is one that is of the utmost importance in laying broad and deep the foundations of the socialist philosophy. It is that mind is not something apart from the rest of the universe, to be explained only by the assertions of theologians or mystics; it is on the contrary an outgrowth and an expression of the universe itself. This little book brings the facts to prove that mind is only another form of "life," and "The Evolution of Man" gave us the evidence that "life" is but a form of that "energy" that is never separated from we will call "matter."

THE EVOLUTION OF MAN.

This work by Wilhelm Boelsche, translated by Ernest Untermann, was published by us in May. The first edition of 2,000 copies was exhausted by the first week of July, and the second edition of 1,570 copies is already more than gone. Comrade Arthur Morrow Lewis of San Francisco, who has been selling this book in connection with his lectures at Pacific coast cities, has broken all records by ordering 700 copies of "The Evolution of Man" in a little over a month. The moral is that the book is one that appeals to new converts and to non-socialists as readily as to party members. While it is strictly scientific and up to date, so that it wins praise from the severest critics, it is also so simple and entertaining that those who have been defrauded of an education can read it with pleasure. It does not contain the word socialism except in the ad-

vertising pages at the end, but it establishes by ample proofs the scientific theory of evolution of which socialism is the logical outcome.

"The Evolution of Man" and "Germs of Mind in Plants" are uniformly bound in cloth, and sell for fifty cents each, postage included.

LATER VOLUMES OF THE LIBRARY OF SCIENCE.

We had intended publishing in this number a full outline of the work by Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer entitled "The End of the World," a translation of which by Margaret Wagner will be the third volume of the library. The publication of this volume is, however, unavoidably delayed for another month, and we will therefore reserve any full description for our September announcement. It will be an illustrated volume describing the forces which will at some future time bring an end to human life on this planet. It will be followed later, probably in 1906, by a companion volume by the same author entitled "The Making of the World," which will treat of the constructive forces which in the never-ending cycles of the universe, bring new worlds into being to take the place of those that die.

The fourth volume of the Library of Science will probably be "Science and Revolution," by Ernest Untermann. In this book he will use some of the material in the series of articles now appearing on the Evolution of the Theory of Evolution, but the form will be recast so as to present this difficult though important subject in a style that will be readily grasped.

The fifth volume will probably be "The Triumph of Life," by Wilhelm Boelsche, author of "The Evolution of Man." This is now being translated by Mrs. May Wood Simons, and we expect to issue it in the early fall. Other volumes will be announced in the near future.

NEW PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS—"WHAT SOCIALISTS THINK."

Our recent publications have been in the line of education rather than propaganda, but we realize that both are needed. And just at this time there seems to be a special demand for leaflets cheap enough to give away, which give some idea of the principles of socialism. To meet this want we are now publishing under the general title "What Socialists Think" five leaflets by Charles H. Kerr, the sub-titles of which are as follows:

1. How we Explain People's Actions.
2. How the Laborer Makes Surplus Value and How the Capitalist Gets it.
3. The Class Struggle between Workers and Owners.
4. The Co-operative Commonwealth.
5. The Socialist Party of America.

One set of these leaflets will be mailed free of charge to any one asking for it and mentioning this notice. A hundred sets will be mailed to any address for thirty cents. A thousand sets will be sent by express at purchaser's expense for \$1.50, and more at the same rate. We are supplying these leaflets at cost to every one, so that there is no discount on them to stockholders. The first edition is 150,000 sets, and we hope to announce soon that the supply is exhausted and a new lot ordered.

RAISING THE DEBT.

We are trying to get the publishing house on a cash basis. We have a capital stock of \$11,860. But we have put a great deal more than this

into books and electrotype plates, into advertising and into the International Socialist Review. So there is a debt. There was a large debt to printers, paper makers and bankers, but that is paid off, except \$400 to one bank, on which we are still paying seven per cent. We are also paying one stockholder six per cent. on \$1,500, and this ought to be paid as soon as possible. The rest of the debt, including \$8,427 to Charles H. Kerr, draws only four per cent. His offer, as published last month, is that for the rest of the year 1905 he will contribute out of the balance due him an amount equal to the contributions of all other stockholders for the sake of putting the company on a cash basis. The contributions so far received on this offer are as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$454 00
Dr. H. Gifford, Nebraska.....	5 00
Martin Nelson, Arizona.....	4 70
B. F. Gayman, British Columbia.....	5 00
Austin Boudreau, Rhode Island.....	3 00
P. R. Skinner, Oregon.....	30 00
J. E. Lehner, Missouri.....	5 00
George D. Herron, New York.....	50 00
W. S. McLean, Washington.....	2 00
Dr. Heinrich Stinnes, Germany.....	8 36
Howard Keehn, Pennsylvania.....	1 00
Innes Sigler, Texas.....	1 00
A. E. Schuttenhelm, Ohio.....	2 00
Joseph Remelsbecker, Ohio.....	5 00
A. F. Simmonds, New York.....	1 00
Dr. H. W. Wilson, Pennsylvania.....	7 90
Alex. Contner, Washington.....	2 00
John Gibson, Kansas.....	1 00
Fred R. Barrett, Maine.....	1 00
Fred M. Landis, Kansas.....	5 00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois.....	139 96
Total.....	<hr/> \$733 92

Apart from this we are glad to announce that the book sales for July amount to \$787.62 as compared with \$562.70 for the corresponding year. The margin on these sales will pay all expenses and leave a considerable sum to apply on the debt. A united effort will soon put the company in a position where every dollar that comes in can be used to bring out the new publications that the movement needs. But the first thing to do is to get the publishing house in such shape that it will be in no way dependent on the life of any one man. If your name is not in the list of contributors, how about putting it there next month?

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

SEPTEMBER, 1905

NO. 3

Study of the Historical Development and Evolution of the American Proletariat.*

THE United States of America is the Promised Land of capitalism. Here for the first time are all the conditions requisite to its full and perfect development. Land and people were never before created so favorable to its highest evolution.

* * * *

The fact is that nowhere else on earth has capitalist society and capitalist character attained so high a degree of development.

Nowhere else does the desire for gain play so great a part; nowhere else is the hunger for profits, the making of money for its own sake, the beginning and end of all economic activity. Every moment of life is filled with this striving, and death alone ends the insatiable pursuit of gain.

The non-capitalist renting class is almost unknown in the United States. This struggle for gain is directed by an economic rationalism of a crudeness unknown in any European community. The capitalist class furthers its interests unaffected by any scruples, even though its way lies over corpses. The statistics of railway accidents prove this assertion. In 1903 the American railroads injured 11,006, the Austrian 172. For every kilometer of

*This very remarkable article by the author of the "Socialism and the Socialist Movement in the Nineteenth Century," and Professor in the University of Breslau, is one of the most searching analyses of American society ever published. The translation published herewith is really but a condensation of the original article, which in turn, is but the introduction to "A Study of the Historical Development of the American Proletariat." We shall endeavor to present the most important portions of the succeeding articles to our readers as they appear.—*Trans.*

road the American injured 3.4, the Austrian .87. For every million persons carried the railways of the United States wounded 19; those of Austria .99.

In power of capital—the height of capitalist accumulation—the United States, in spite of its “youth,” stands far in advance of all other lands. The gauge by which the height of the capitalist flood is measured are the figures of the bank balances. In 1882 the Controller of the Currency reported 7,302 banks; in 1904 there were 18,844. Those of the earlier year had a capital of \$712,100,000; those of the latter, \$1,473,904,674. * * * The total “banking power” at this later period (including capital, surplus profits, deposits and circulation) was \$13,826,000,000; while the corresponding figures for all the other countries of the world was but \$19,781,000,000. After this we need not be surprised at the sums that have flowed into the lap of industry during the last twenty years. According to the census, the capital invested in manufactures has been as follows:

1880.....	\$2,709,282,606
1890.....	6,525,050,759
1900.....	9,831,486,500

It is thoroughly recognized that the United States is the one country in which the program of the Marxian theory of evolution has been most minutely fulfilled, in that the accumulation of capital has reached the stage designated in a celebrated chapter of “Capital” as immediately preceding the *Götterdämmerung* of the capitalist world.

* * * *

When the giant combinations of capital are considered as a whole it will be evident that they control the largest share of American industry, and reach the enormous figures of \$20,379,000,000 nominal capital.

Just how absolutely the capitalist system rules can perhaps best be seen by a study of the present social structure, scarcely a feature of which is of non-capitalist origin. Nowhere do we meet with those survivals of a pre-capitalistic class, whose greater or less prominence in European society give it its characteristic features. There is no feudal nobility; the magnates of capital reign supreme in the social realm. The time described by Marx in “Capital” as then existing only in prophetic imagination has arrived in the United States of to-day, where “eminent spinners,” “influential shoe black dealers,” “extensive sausage makers,” together with the “railroad kings,” have their feet upon the necks of the people. * * *

The United States is to-day a land of cities; or more exactly,

a land of *great* cities. [While the number of people living in cities of two thousand population and over is somewhat less than in Germany, yet the percentage of inhabitants of great cities (having over 100,000 population) is greater than anywhere else on earth, except in England. Furthermore, the percentage is a rapidly increasing one, and would even now be much higher were it not for the inclusion of the backward agricultural South.]

But when I say that the United States is a "city-land," I mean it in a deeper, more fundamental sense, that can only be explained by showing the relation which the city bears to capitalism. I mean it in the sense of a method of living that is foreign to all organic life, resting on a purely mechanical basis, and determined wholly from the quantitative point of view. The European city is generally an organic growth; at bottom, it is only a grown-up village. What has Nuremburg in common with Chicago? Nothing save the superficial feature that many people live close together on streets, and depend upon products brought in from without for their sustenance. Their spirits have nothing in common. The former is a village-like, organically developed structure; the latter is artificially constructed according to a "rational," mechanical plan, in which all traces of community life are eliminated. When a European city spreads out over the country, some of the rural features are still preserved. In the United States, on the contrary, the open country is itself, at bottom but a city settlement, where the actual city is lacking. The same "rational" attitude that gave rise to the box-like cities has accompanied the surveyor's chain over the whole country, cutting it up into those uniform squares which make impossible, from the very beginning, any naturally developed "organic" settlement.

That other most striking characteristic of all societies resting on a capitalistic basis—sharp contrasts between the rich and the poor—is by no means absent in the United States. * * * Whatever may be the exact division of the total wealth, there is no disputing the fact that nowhere else on earth are the absolute contrasts between the rich and the poor anything near as sharp. This is true because, first of all, the "rich" are so much richer than anywhere else. There are certainly more people in America who possess a thousand million marks than there are that possess a hundred million marks in Germany.

* * * *

On the other hand the misery of the slums of the great cities in America is equaled only in the East End of London. [Here follow some statistics from Robert Hunter's "Poverty," with which our readers are already familiar.]

But the one infallible sign of the high development of capitalism in the United States is the peculiar character of its intel-

lectual culture. The existence of any general American character has been repeatedly denied, and it is undoubtedly true that the diversities between the different sections are as great as between the different European nations. Nevertheless there is a uniformity to the American mind. This "American spirit," however, is not something wholly new and peculiar. We meet it as an old acquaintance, whom we learned to know in Lombard St. and Berlin W., save that in America the type has been perfected and has spread over an entire nation. It is easy to trace the origin of this type to a definite environment that arose in Europe and attained its full development in America, and in so doing we shall find an explanation of its uniformity.

No one who has investigated the popular mind in America can avoid seeing that its characteristic features are just the ones having their root in the capitalist organization of society.

It is universally recognized that the fundamental feature of a capitalist society is the reduction of all things to a money standard. When this has continued for generations, all sensitiveness to purely qualitative elements of wealth gradually disappear. Value is assigned only to those things which are either "useful" and "comfortable," or else "costly." The sense for expensiveness is seen in the fact that everything that is decorated in the United States is "over-loaded," from the ladies' toilets to the reception rooms of the fashionable hotels. If "costliness" is not apparent, then every opportunity is taken to display the figures that tell of its valuation. "Have you seen the \$50,000 Rembrandt in Mr. X's house yet?" is a frequently heard question. "Early this morning the \$500,000 yacht of Mr. Carnegie left the harbor," is a newspaper item. Naturally the possession of money—the amount of income—becomes the standard for the valuation of men. All sense of the immeasurable differences in personalities and all breath of individuality disappears.

There can be no doubt that this habit of estimating everything in terms of a money valuation has so warped the judgment for value that attempts are constantly made to apply the money standard where it is wholly out of place. It leads naturally to that over-valuation of mere *quantity*, which so many observers have noted as one of the most evident of American characteristics. Every large quantity becomes an object of admiration: whether it be the number of inhabitants of a city, the number of packages sent by the post office, the speed of railroad trains, the height of a monument, the breadth of a river or the frequency of suicides. This "mania for bigness," so characteristic of modern Americans, has been ascribed to the great extent of their country. But if this is the cause, why do not the Chinese have it? Or the Mongolians on the plains of Asia? Why did not the Indians have it, who formerly lived in the same country? Whenever such ideas

of greatness appear among primitive peoples they take on a cosmical character; they deal with the endless firmament of the stars, the boundless limits of the steppe, and their fundamental characteristic is just their *immeasurableness*. The worship of *statistical* largeness as a part of the human mentality can have its roots nowhere else except in the utilization of money according to the methods of capitalism.

Those who reckon value only in terms of quantity soon tend to *compare* two objects in order to measure one by the other, and to assign the higher value to the larger. When one of two things becomes larger in a given period this is called success. The sense of measurable greatness has as a noteworthy accompaniment a high valuation of success: once more a prominent American characteristic. To gain success, however, always means to *beat someone else*, to get more, do more, have more than someone else—to be bigger. Naturally that sort of success is valued the highest that can be expressed in figures—especially getting rich. Even for the non-trader, the one question is “how much can he make” with his talents?

Some of the peculiar mental attitudes that arise from this are shown perhaps the clearest in the American attitude toward “sport.” Here the only question of interest is “who won?” I was once present at a mass-meeting in New York that received telegraphic bulletins of a match being played in Chicago. The only items that aroused excitement were those that settled questions of victory. * * * Betting serves to arouse this excitement and at the same time reduce the whole field of sport to a purely money basis.

* * * *

This peculiar method of judging value gives a definite trend to the whole social mind. The American prays to success, and therefore all his efforts are directed toward leading a life that shall be pleasing to his God. So it is that every American from newsboy up is possessed with an unrest, a yearning and seeking to attain the top by climbing over others. The life ideal of the Americans is not found in the pleasurable development of self, nor in the beautiful harmony of a well-rounded life, but only in “getting ahead.” From this there follows as a natural consequence the restless striving, the reckless competition in every field. Since all are seeking success, therefore everyone is forced into a struggle to beat every other individual; and a steeple-chase begins—a race for fortune—a race that differs from all other races in that the goal is not fixed but constantly moves ever further away from the runners. The term “restless” is often applied to this struggle, but it is still more evidently *endless*; for any endeavor must be endless that seeks only quantity, since this is always boundless.

Out of this competitive psychology there arises naturally the demand for more elbow room. With a race as the ideal of life, no one wishes to be tied hand and foot. The dogma of *laissez faire*, therefore, is the natural economic maxim of Americans. * * * Nevertheless the American is not at all doctrinaire on this point, and does not hesitate to use the state to any degree, when it will further, or even not interfere with, his race for "success."

For the genuine American to be successful means "get rich." This explains why the characteristic restless striving of Americans finds its principle outlet in the field of industry. The ablest and most active minds, which in Europe enter political life, in America turn to trade. This again leads to an over-valuation of industrial pursuits, since it is in this field that the great object of striving—wealth—can be soonest attained. Industry in the capitalistic sense deals with stocks and bonds and has its seat on the Board of Trade. * * * There is no other country on earth where so large a proportion of the population participate in stock speculation, or in which the population is so thoroughly impregnated with the capitalist idea.

This completes the circle of our observations. We started from capitalism and found in it the source of the essential elements of the American popular mind. Now we see how the very proof (*Bethätigung*) of this contributes to an increase and growth of the very essence of capitalism, and that the peculiar "American spirit" is ever re-born from itself, and ever purifies itself in the *spiritus capitalisticus, purus rectificatus*.

* * * *

These remarks are intended merely as a starting point for a few observations concerning the American proletariat. Since we know that the conditions of the wage working class are determined by the essential features of the capitalist movement, and especially since we have learned that all "social movements" originate in the environment created by capitalism, and that modern socialism is only a reflex phenomena, then it is self-evident that we must proceed from a consideration of the economic situation if we are to form any clear conception of the condition of the proletariat of any country. This method is especially fruitful for the United States. * * *

If it is true, as I have always held, that modern socialism is a necessary product of capitalism, then it follows that the land having the highest capitalist development (which is the United States) must also be the classic land of socialism, and its laboring class must be the leader in the most radical socialist movement. When, however, the assertion is constantly repeated (complainingly among socialists, rejoicingly among their opponents) that the opposite is the case; that there is no socialism among the

American laboring class, and that those who are called socialists are really only a handful of bankrupt Germans with no following—then we have a land without socialism in spite of the highest capitalist development. The doctrine of the inevitable future is disproved by the facts. There can be no more important work for the sociologist or practical worker than to fathom this phenomenon.

But when we come to examine the facts we find that this bold assertion that there is no socialism in America is indisputably false.

There is a socialist party, or to speak exactly, two socialist parties on a thoroughly continental European basis. These parties cast 453,338 votes at the last presidential election. * * *

Nevertheless it can not be denied that there is a measure of truth in the statement that the American laboring class is far removed from socialism.

* * * *

The American laborer (so far at least as the "normal" laborer, whose votes seem to dominate the majority of the laboring class and among whom are included the leaders) is on the whole not *dissatisfied* with existing conditions; on the contrary he feels very well and is very well satisfied with himself—like all Americans. His view of the world (*Weltauffassung*) is most rosyly optimistic—live and let live is his fundamental maxim.

This unbounded optimism, which is his most prominent characteristic, expresses itself in a faith in *the mission and greatness of his country*—a faith that often takes on an almost religious character: for him the Americans are the chosen people of God—the salt of the earth. * * * This means, however, that the American laborer identifies himself with the present American state and is most intensely patriotic. The centrifugal force that leads to class divisions, class antagonisms, class hatred and the class struggle is weak, while the centripetal force that leads to endorsement of the national political commonwealth of the state—to patriotism—is strong; consequently there is a lack among American workers of that enmity to the state so characteristic of continental European socialists.

* * * *

The American laborer is not in any way antagonistic to the *capitalist economic system as such*, neither mentally nor sentimentally. [Quotations are here given from John Mitchell and other pure and simple trade unionists to prove this point.]

Indeed I believe that the relation of the American laborer to capitalism is even more intimate than even these friendly declarations and testimonials of respect really express. I believe he enters into it with all his heart: I believe he loves it. At least he

gives himself up to it body and soul. If there is any one place in America where the restless striving for gain, the complete surrender to industry, the sacrifice of all to business has its home it is among the laborers. The laborer will—practically without limit—earn all that his strength will possibly permit. Consequently it is very seldom that we hear any complaints concerning the lack of protection against dangerous machinery. Indeed he would ordinarily much rather not have such protection if it reduced his earning capacity in the least. Consequently there are very few complaints about restriction of output or objections to piece-work or improved machinery. * * * The greater intensity of American labor is nothing more than the expression of the laborer's fundamentally capitalist mental attitude.

That it is the "business spirit" which rules the American movement is best shown by the peculiar character of their labor organizations.

* * * *

The majority of the American labor organizations do not differ in any essential way from the earlier English trades unions. They proceed from a purely business point of view which leads to exclusiveness and monopolistic attempts to divide the interests of the various organizations and to a disregard of the interests of the proletariat as a whole, and especially of the interests of the lower layer of unskilled workers. As a result strong craft antagonisms arise, which lead to an essentially vertical dismemberment of the proletariat, and prevent any joining together into a single solid defensive class. This business policy finds its clearest expression in the coalitions between monopolistic trades unions and monopolistic bosses for the common exploitation of the public by a few employers and by the laborers of the single trade. This kind of trades unions, because they are cut from wood taken from the tree of capitalism, and because their tendencies as well as their practical operations are not directed toward the overthrow of the capitalist system, *may well be designated as capitalist unions, as contrasted with socialist unions which never lose sight of the necessity of a proletarian class movement directed toward capitalism.*

WERNER SOMBART in *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft.*

Translated by A. M. Simons.

The Political Position of the Labor and Socialist Party in Australia.

TO UNDERSTAND the present position of the Socialist movement in Australia it is necessary to have regard to the time when there was not even a political labor movement in these states, and that is only fourteen years ago. In 1890 there was no labor movement, politically speaking, although in Victoria a trade union official, Mr. W. Trenwith, was active as a trade unionist and a protectionist. The dividing line in politics was almost exclusively the fiscal question. Free Trade versus Protection, the workmen in Victoria being mainly Protectionists and in the neighboring state of New South Wales mainly Free Traders.

In 1890 a strike occurred, known as the maritime strike. It originated with the officers of vessels, but the general body of workers made common cause with the marine men and throughout the whole of the Australasian states, including New Zealand, a severe and prolonged struggle took place.

The men were badly beaten, and the employers having used the governmental machinery of the various states against the men so viciously and effectively, opened the eyes of the men to the foolishness of returning employers to the respective legislatures. From that time the desirability and necessity of political action independent of if not in direct opposition to the monopolist class has been advocated; but for years after scarcely a labor parliamentarian ever advocated or realized the necessity for Socialism.

As in most countries, in each state an occasional Socialist would arrest the attention of a small number and give a little tilt to the study of economic questions. But although the workers in the respective states gradually added to the number of members returned as labor men, it meant but little beyond the endorsement of trade union conditions plus in Victoria wages-boards and in New Zealand an industrial conciliation and arbitration act for the adjustment of wages and working conditions by law.

And still here were the beginnings of a class-conscious movement, and small Socialist organizations were established in each of the states.

Even five years ago the Melbourne Trades Hall, the rendezvous of the organized workers industrially and politically, had very little sympathy with Socialism, while quite a large propor-

tion of the delegates were avowedly hostile, and the same was true as regards the workers' centers in each of the other states.

In Sydney, N. S. W., there is an active propagandist body, the Australian Socialist League; in Melbourne, Victoria, there is a similar body, the Social Democratic Party; in Brisbane, Queensland, they have the Social Democratic Vanguard; in Perth, Western Australia, the Social Democratic Federation, and in Adelaide, South Australia, there is a Clarion Fellowship Society; but none of these bodies have successfully returned any of their members to the legislative bodies. Although the ex-secretary of the Victorian S. D. P., H. Scott-Bennett, who stood as a Socialist candidate at the last Victorian election was returned, he was endorsed by and ran as the candidate of the Political Labor Council. In Sydney and other portions of N. S. W. members of the A. S. L. have fought elections on a number of occasions and polled well but have not been returned.

There is no room for doubt but that the various Labor Parties in Australia are now rapidly becoming straight out Socialist organizations; and the progress in this direction during the last three years is easily seen by any one.

The Federal Labor Party is of course composed of the same persons as the State Parties. The Parliamentary Federal Labor Party is a virile body of fighters; none of whom are anti-Socialist, two-thirds of whom are Socialists.

The Platform of the Party is not one of a drastic character nor is it issued with a statement of principles that clearly sets forth the justification for and necessity of a change from capitalism to collectivism as is usually the case with the European Parties, still they stand as the force receiving all the hard knocks of the various plutocratic parties and are travelling pretty rapidly in a Socialist direction, partly as a result of the spread of knowledge and largely as the result of politico economic pressure.

The Labor Party is called a Socialist Party by its enemies, and although some members of the Labor Party doubtless wish Socialism had remained in Europe or lost itself on the way out, the more capable of the Labor Party have declared in favor of Socialism in too pronounced a way for any of them now to draw back.

The following is the Platform of the Federal Labor Party:

1. Maintenance of a White Australia.
2. Compulsory Arbitration to settle industrial disputes, (now secured.)
3. Old Age Pensions.
4. Nationalization of Monopolies.
5. Citizen Military Defence Force and Australian owned Navy.

6. Restriction of Public Borrowing.
7. Navigation Laws.

Not much straight out Socialism here, and if this covered the whole case it would be most unsatisfactory, but during the past year three of the State Labor Parties, viz.: New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia have each included in their constitution, the declared object of the Party to be: "The securing of the full results of their industry to all producers by the collective ownership of monopolies, and the extension of the industrial and economic functions of the state and municipality."

It is not to rest here however. Before this reaches you in Chicago, there will be held in Melbourne an Interstate Conference of delegates from the respective Labor Parties and part of Melbourne's contribution to the agenda of the forthcoming conference is as follows:

"Conference affirms that capitalism is the enemy and destroyer of essential private property. Its development is through the legalized confiscation of all that the labor of the working class produces above its subsistence wage. The private ownership of the means of employment grounds society in economic slavery, which renders intellectual and political tyranny inevitable. Therefore, conference affirms that it is the object of the Australian labor organizations to obtain control of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange, i. e.: the means of employment—wealth production—to be owned and controlled by the people in the interest of, and for the use of the whole of the people, in contradistinction to profit for a class.

Further: As the object of capitalism is the same in all countries, i. e., the exploitation of the worker—one who is divorced from the means of employment, and forced to sell his labor power as a commodity for the right to live—conference affirms it desirable that the Australia Labor organization pledges its fidelity to the principles of international socialism, as embodied in the united thought and action of the Socialists of all nations." This proposition well indicates the advance made by the Labor Party in Melbourne and gives warranty for concluding that in a few years' time not only will the principle contained in the proposition be heartily endorsed by the Workers' Party in the State, but also that the representatives of that party in the State Legislature will be the governing body.

In the Federal House of Representatives there are three parties each having about one-third of the total of 72 members composing the House. The present premier is the Hon. G. H. Reid whose foremost political incentive and object is Free Trade. At present he is dragging along with a majority of two, i. e., a majority of the protectionists vote with the Free Trade plutocrat

rather than be supporters of the Labor Party. The Protectionists under the leadership of the Hon. Alfred Deakin are opposed to Socialism much the same as the Free Traders, but most of the Labor men are Protectionist as against Free Trade though they put Labor first. Under such circumstances it will not be surprising if the Protectionists and Labor Party attempt a coalition, but a large portion of the rank and file of the Labor Party are opposed to alliances of this sort and they may be strong enough to prevent it. In the Victorian Legislative assembly out of a total of 68 members, 18 are straight-out Labor, about three-fourths of whom are Socialists, and they are doing good, propagandist work.

A similar proportion in N. S. Wales Assembly keeps the Plutocrats very watchful and busy.

In the Queensland Assembly out of a total of 72 members the Labor Party have exactly half and they have formed a coalition government, with two labor members in the ministry, Mr. Kedston as State Treasurer and Mr. Peter Airey as Home Secretary. In Western Australia there is actually a Labor Ministry in power and has been so now for twelve months. This is the longest spell of any Labor government. Of course it is not a large population. All told Western Australia has but 250,000 population so it is almost like playing at government. Still all the institutions are there, and the plutocrats are there and they have an enormous and very rich area, W. A. being 975,920 square miles in extent.

The State elections for South Australia took place six weeks ago, and the election cry was, Socialism and Anti-Socialism; the result is cheering. The Labor Party before the election had only six members in the assembly; as the result of the election they now have 15 members in an assembly of 42.

Tasmania has made a start and at the last State election returned four labor men and their delegates will be at the Interstate Conference.

New Zealand is not included in the Commonwealth of Australia and is not directly affected by the political activities here. At present New Zealand is in the backwash as she has no straight out labor men or Socialists in the legislative chamber, they are all of the petty bourgeois type, but steps are now being taken to organize on purely independent lines.

This progress is certainly being made, but many of us are expecting to see the rapid economic development of the United States make of that country the pace setter in the realization of full-fledged Socialism.

TOM MANN.

Melbourne, Victoria, June 28, 1905.

Australian Labor Convention.

THE Interstate Labor Convention has just taken place and it has gladdened the hearts of the State socialists by the adoption of the following objective:

(a) Securing the full results of their industry to all producers by collective ownership of monopolies and the extension of the industrial and economic functions of the State and of the following objective:

(b) Cultivation of an Australian sentiment based upon the maintenance of racial purity and the development in Australia of an enlightened and self-reliant community.

In moving the adoption of this objective Watson, the leader of the Federal Labor Party, stated that it was purposeless to look for a seventh heaven, and the Victorian and Queensland objectives went much further than generations would see. Personally he was not a social democrat, but believed that State Socialism was the only practical form. It was not proposed to nationalize all industry, but monopolies should be in public and not in private hands. One member of the convention stated that he was a social democrat and held that State Socialism was bureaucracy, but still he favored the objective. Another prominent member of the party, who was a member of the Federal Labor Ministry, said that the Labor Party had only been called socialists two years ago, but they had nothing to do with the international socialist movement.

This same objective had been previously adopted by the New South Wales Labor Party. It was hailed by enthusiastic laborites everywhere as a great step in advance. Mr. Watson himself, however, was the means of dispelling this illusion by pointing out to the timid supporters of the party that in 1897 the Labor Party had as one of the planks of their platform "The nationalization of land and the means of production, distribution and exchange." This plank has since been removed from the platform and after some considerable cutting down has again put in an appearance as the Party's Objective.

The Queensland Labor Convention also presented the Labor Party of that state with an ornamental piece of timber in the form of the following objective:

(a) Securing the full results of their industry to the wealth producers by the collective ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, to be obtained through the extension

of the industrial and economic functions of the state and local governing bodies.

(b) Cultivation of an Australian sentiment based on the maintenance of racial purity and the development in Australia of an enlightened and self-reliant community.

The Victorian Labor Party has adopted an objective of somewhat similar import.

The reason for this attack of objective-framing is to be found in the present state of unstable political equilibrium. While the Labor Party were in office in the Federal Parliament they allied themselves with a small section of the Protectionist Party, who would make no compromise with the free traders. The Labor Government was defeated on the Arbitration Bill and an understanding was arrived at between Reid (leader of the Free-Trade Party) and Deakin (leader of the Protectionists) by which the first issue was to be dropped. Reid came into office supported by most of the protectionists, the irreconcilable protectionists and the Labor Party occupying the Opposition benches and maintaining their alliance. Reid has sought to consolidate his following by raising the banner of "anti-socialism" and by labeling the Labor Party socialists. He has toured Australia, speaking in every state on this question, and has thus, by arousing public interest, forced the Labor Party to make some declaration. Another cause of the forcing of the hands of the Party has been the discontent of the Labor supporters with the Labor alliances, more especially with the Coalition Government in Queensland. Last August an election took place in Queensland, at which the Coalition Government were greatly strengthened. The Labor Party now number one-half of the Lower House, and yet planks of the Labor Party are treated with no more respect than if they were the merest shavings. Firm believers in the value of the Labor platform naturally resented this sort of thing and the Coalition Government has fallen into disfavor, the Labor Party are warned against alliances with other parties and the rank and file of the party are in revolt against the labor politicians and have accordingly sought to bind the party by means of the objective.

Reid's attempt to scare the protectionists with the cry of "Socialism" has proved ineffectual. The manufacturers of Australia were not to be caught with chaff and Deakin last month deserted the standard of fiscal compromise and with the help of the Labor Party has put Reid out of office and is now Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, with the support of the Labor Party guaranteed for one session. It is significant that three of the ministers in the present government are allies of Labor, one of whom (Sir William Lyne) has outdone many of his Labor friends by announcing himself a State Socialist. If this ministry retains office, the manufacturers are likely to get something more

substantial than anti-socialist vaporings in the form of a high tariff wall. The Federal Labor Convention has declared in favor of taking a referendum of the people of the Commonwealth on the fiscal question. If such a referendum be taken it is almost certain to result in a protectionist tariff. The Labor Party has been moving Protectionwards for some time and it is only the adoption of some such plank as tariff referendum which could prevent them from ultimately entering the Protectionist fold. It is this reason which makes the protectionists more eager to secure alliances with the Labor Party. It is this fact also which explains the circumstance that no prominent protectionist has taken any part in the so-called anti-socialist campaign.

The word socialism is in everyone's mouth, but one never hears anything about a class struggle. The one bright spot amid all the confusion is supplied by the Australian Socialist League, who, by sheer grit and perseverance, are beginning to make themselves heard among the working class of New South Wales. Out of all the voluminous paper contributions on the subject of Socialism the declaration of the A. S. L. was the only clear and class-conscious effort. It was pointed out that labor was the sole creator of wealth; that the present methods of production depended on the wage-slavery of the workers; that in Australia $71\frac{1}{2}$ of the adults who die have no property that necessitates making a will; that the cause of the trouble lay in the private ownership of the land and of the machinery of production. It was pointed out that "the class who do the world's work will not be deterred by the word 'confiscation' when they are ripe for action at the ballot-box."

Right throughout the Australian colonies we still have New Zealand held up to us as "the workingman's paradise." Yet towards the end of June Dick Seddon himself (New Zealand's premier) declared: "Despite the increased wages, the workers found themselves no better off than they were formerly, on account of the increased cost of living. It was not the employers or the workers who scooped the money, but the people who took the increased value of land and property as their profit, and reaped the reward earned by the employers and the workers." It would seem from this that Compulsory Conciliation and Arbitration had not benefited the lot of the workers. A humiliating confession to come from the High Priest of Conciliation! The New South Wales Arbitration Court has been shut up for six months because the state judges were unwilling to act on it. In the meantime the Federal High Court has pulverized the clause granting preference to unionists and has placed the non-unionist and the unionist on an equal footing according to law, but according to practice is bound to result in preference to non-unionists.

Still the belief in Conciliation and Arbitration is not killed and the unions of New South Wales' will provide the re-opened court with abundance of work.

ANDREW M. ANDERSON.

My Mammy's Son.

I don't want to see him crushed, my dear old mammy's son,
The boy I played with long ago, whose chinas oft I won;
Who stood with me in many fights in the old plantation days;
Whose heart was true and loyal in a thousand different ways.

I don't want to see him crushed, his children made the prey
Of every wolf that howls along the Anglo-Saxon way;
Of every low-browed, heartless thing that bays him with the scream:
"I am the Anglo-Saxon and I am the white supreme!"

I don't want to see him crushed, his black face scarred with grief,
His sorrows made unending, or his pleasures few and brief;
For often I remember how he stood there at my side,
When the old home went to pieces, with a friendship true and tried.

I don't want to see him crushed, his life-work made in vain,
His misery the corner stone of demagogic gain;
His degradation the excuse for Pharisees on high,
A refuge for the scoundrel and a cloak for every lie.

I don't want to see him crushed, nor made a nameless thing,
A chattel in the service of the menials of the king;
A slave unto the servants who attend the lords of gold,
Who are rotting the structure that the fathers built of old.

I don't want to see him crushed, my dear old mammy's son,
The boy I played with long ago, whose chinas I oft won;
And for his sake an Aryan pleads with Aryans to-day
To rise in Aryan manhood and drive the wolves away.

COVINGTON HALL.

The Rights of the Horse and the Rights of Man.

CAPITALIST Civilization has endowed the wage-worker with the metaphysical Rights of Man, but this is only to rivet him more closely and more firmly to his economic duty.

"I make you free," so speak the Rights of Man to the laborer, "free to earn a wretched living and turn your employer into a millionaire; free to sell him your liberty for a mouthful of bread. He will imprison you ten hours or twelve hours in his workshop; he will not let you go till you are wearied to the marrow of your bones, till you have just enough strength left to gulp down your soup and sink into a heavy sleep. You have but one of your rights that you may not sell, and that is the right to pay taxes.

Progress and Civilization may be hard on wage-working humanity, but they have all a mother's tenderness for the animals which stupid bipeds call "lower."

Civilization has especially favored the equine race: it would be too great a task to go through the long list of its benefactions; I will name but a few, of general notoriety, that I may awaken and inflame the passionate desires of the workers, now torpid in their misery.

Horses are divided into distinct classes. The equine aristocracy enjoys so many and so oppressive privileges, that if the human-faced brutes which serve them as jockeys, trainers, stable valets and grooms were not morally degraded to the point of not feeling their shame, they would have rebelled against their lords and masters, whom they rub down, groom, brush and comb, also making their beds, cleaning up their excrements and receiving bites and kicks by way of thanks.

Aristocratic horses, like capitalists, do not work; and when they exercise themselves in the fields they look disdainfully, with a coupon-clipper's contempt, upon the human animals which plow and seed the lands, mow and rake the meadows, to provide them with oats, clover, timothy and other succulent plants.

These four-footed favorites of Civilization command such social influence that they impose their wills upon the capitalists, their brothers in privilege; they force the loftiest of them to come with their beautiful ladies and take tea in the stables, in-

haling the acrid perfumes of their solid and liquid evacuations. And when these lords consent to parade in public, they require from ten to twenty thousand men and women to stack themselves up on uncomfortable seats, under the broiling sun, to admire their exquisitely chiseled forms and their feats of running and leaping. They respect none of the social dignities before which the votaries of the Rights of Man bow in reverence. At Chantilly not long ago one of the favorites for the grand prize launched a kick at the king of Belgium, because it did not like the looks of his head. His royal majesty, who adores horses, murmured an apology and withdrew.

It is fortunate that these horses, who can count more authentic ancestors than the houses of Orleans and Hohenzollern, have not been corrupted by their high social station: had they taken it into their heads to rival the capitalists in aesthetic pretensions, profligate luxury and depraved tastes, such as wearing lace and diamonds, and drinking champagne and Chateau-Margaux, a blacker misery and more overwhelming drudgery would be impending over the class of wage-workers.

Thrice happy is it for proletarian humanity that these equine aristocrats have not taken the fancy of feeding upon human flesh, like the old Bengal tigers which rove around the villages of India to carry off women and children; if unhappily the horses had been man-eaters, the capitalists, who can refuse them nothing, would have built slaughter-houses for wage-workers, where they could carve out and dress boy sirloins, woman hams and girl roasts to satisfy their anthropophagic tastes.

The proletarian horses, not so well endowed, have to work for their peck of oats, but the capitalist class, through deference for the aristocrats of the equine race, concedes to the working horses rights that are far more solid and real than those inscribed in the "Rights of Man."

The first of rights, the right to existence, which no civilized society will recognize for laborers, is possessed by horses.

The colt, even before his birth, while still in the fetus state, begins to enjoy the right to existence; his mother, when her pregnancy has scarcely begun, is discharged from all work and sent into the country to fashion the new being in peace and comfort; she remains near him to suckle him and teach him to choose the delicious grasses of the meadow, in which he gambols until he is grown.

The moralists and politicians of the "Rights of Man" think it would be monstrous to grant such rights to the laborers; I raised a tempest in the Chamber of Deputies when I asked that women, two months before and two months after confinement, should have the right and the means to absent themselves from the factory. My proposition upset the ethics of civilization

and shook the capitalist order.' What an abominable abomination—to demand for babies the rights of colts.

As for the young proletarians, they can scarcely trot on their little toes before they are condemned to hard labor in the prisons of capitalism, while the colts develop freely under kindly Nature; care is taken that they be completely formed before they are set to work, and their tasks are proportioned to their strength with a tender care.

This care on the part of the capitalists follows them all through their lives. We may still recall the noble indignation of the bourgeois press when it learned that the omnibus company was using peat and tannery waste in its stalls as a substitute for straw: to think of the unhappy horses having such poor beds! The more delicate souls of the bourgeoisie have in every capitalist country organized societies for the protection of animals, in order to prove that they can not be excited by the fate of the small victims of industry. Schopenhauer, the bourgeois philosopher, in whom was incarnated so perfectly the gross egoism of the philistine, could not hear the cracking of a whip without his heart being torn by it.

This same omnibus company, which works its laborers from fourteen to sixteen hours a day, requires from its dear horses only five to seven hours. It has bought green meadows in which they may recuperate from fatigue or indisposition. Its policy is to expend more for the entertainment of a quadruped than for paying the wages of a biped. It has never occurred to any legislator nor to any fanatical advocate of the "Rights of Man" to reduce the horse's daily pittance to assure him a retreat that would be of service to him only after his death.

The Rights of Horses have not been posted up; they are "unwritten rights," as Socrates called the laws implanted by Nature in the consciousness of all men.

The horse has shown his wisdom in contenting himself with these rights, with no thought of demanding those of the citizen; he has judged that he would have been as stupid as man if he had sacrificed his mess of lentils for the metaphysical banquet of Rights to Revolt, to Equality, to Liberty, and other trivialities which to the proletariat are about as useful as a cautery on a wooden leg.

Civilization, though partial to the equine race, has not shown herself indifferent to the fate of the other animals. Sheep, like canons, pass their days in pleasant and plentiful idleness; they are fed in the stable on barley, lucerne, rutabagas and other roots, raised by wage-workers; shepherds conduct them to feed in fat pastures, and when the sun parches the plain, they are carried to where they can browse on the tender grass of the mountains.

The Church, which has burned her heretics, and regrets that

she can not again bring up her faithful sons in the love of "mutton," represents Jesus, under the form of a kind shepherd, bearing upon his shoulders a weary lamb.

True, the love for the ram and the ewe is in the last analysis only the love for the leg of mutton and the cutlet, just as the Liberty of the Rights of Man is nothing but the slavery of the wage-worker, since our jesuitical Civilization always disguises capitalist exploitation in eternal principles and bourgeois egoism in noble sentiments; yet at least the bourgeois tends and fattens the sheep up to the day of the sacrifice, while he seizes the laborer still warm from the workshop and lean from toil to send him to the shambles of Tonquin or Madagascar.

Laborers of all crafts, you who toil so hard to create your poverty of producing the wealth of the capitalists, arise, arise! Since the buffoons of parliament unfurl the Rights of Man, do you boldly demand for yourselves, your wives and your children the Rights of the Horse.

PAUL LAFARGUE, (*Translated by Charles H. Kerr.*)

General Election in Holland.

FEW of us expected the actual results of the elections that took place in the second part of June. We did not expect the overthrow of the clerical-conservative government, nor did we think the number of votes for the social democracy would grow so largely as it did.

In 1901 we reached the number of about 39,000 votes on our candidates. Had nothing *extraordinary* passed in the next four years, perhaps we would have dreamt of doubling our strength in and outside of Parliament. But as those who followed Dutch affairs will remember, in 1903 we had first in the end of January the great and for the moment successful railway strike, when the railway companies had to give in to the men and the "Christian" government and the bourgeoisie lost its head over the fact that the workers were for one day masters of the traffic. Then came the reaction. The companies grew bolder every day and the government threatened the railway men and the whole working class with laws that would prevent the trade unions from developing their strength. To throw down and to terrify the opposition from the workers the government raised the militia, so that the most direct and strong measures of the working class had to be put in action. Thus the general strike was attempted, for we in Holland, in so-called free Holland, have not yet the universal suffrage so that we could threaten a reactionary government with the votes of the workers. The general strike in Holland, a heroic but desperate measure, as the workers are not united but divided into socialistic, non-political (so-called anarchistic) and Christian groups—the general strike, we mean to say, proved a failure as a means to prevent the government from measures of retaliation against the working class and its trade unions. So it weakened many already weak unions and it intensified the class struggle by the damage done through the strike to the middle classes throughout town and field. The social democrats came to stand, as is right, all by themselves, and many of us, let us not say feared, but stated that with the next great election we would certainly not only not double our contingent of votes and seats, but would have the greatest difficulty in keeping what we have. We had a thousand or so less votes than 40,000 in 1901. We would be glad to win a few thousand more than this number in 1905.

Seen in the light of these unquestionable considerations our

success was great. More than 65,000 votes were given to Socialist candidates in the 75 or 76 (of the 100) districts where Socialists stood for Parliament. We won six seats for Parliament by the second ballot in the elections of 1901, we got seven seats by the second ballot of this year. True it is that we lost one seat, obtained by social democracy in a contest for a Parliamentary vacancy after the general election of 1901; true that we lost another seat; but we won one that we never had held before and all in all the results are, as we have said: *Over 25,000 votes increase and one seat more* than we obtained at the former general election.

Yet I have only mentioned one of the obstacles that prevented a great Parliamentary victory for Socialism. But there were more than one. Holland has for a long run of years hardly ever been governed by any other cabinet than one of the Liberal party. We had about fifteen years ago one "Christian" Conservative minister and that was all. And now in 1901 the Christian cabinet was formed under the premiership of Dr. Kuyper, a man who tried a very personal government. In fact, he did not rule on any principles but on these two: That capitalism had to be strengthened against the rising power of the workers and that *he* had to be the one and all in the State of Holland. No queen, no secretary of state was reckoned with. He tried to be, not in name, perhaps, but in fact, the absolute President of a Dutch Republic. To attain this he gave the higher and the lower offices to his favorites, the more insignificant the better, and every one who wanted to be an official had to believe in God of the Calvinists and in Dr. Kuyper, their prophet. So that the opposition grew day by day. Not only the workers and the Socialists, not only the liberals and the democrats, but the intellectual people, the teachers and the professors, even a great many of the parsons—Dr. Kuyper himself had been a minister in his younger days—went into the opposition. The Socialists of course asked for real liberty, the economical freedom for material existence with all its consequences. But the liberals and the democrats and the intellectuals asked the freedom of the mind, freedom of the school, freedom of the university, freedom of religion. And as Kuyper wanted to lean on the large and little proprietors of the ground, and therefore asked protection, the cry for free trade also was mixed in the great choir of voices that shouted for freedom in everything and deliverance of Kuyper. And all these cries overshadowed the cry of the people for a free existence, and it was a hard work for Holland's social democracy to stand upright and independent in that fierce struggle against both capitalistic parties.

Again I say, seen in this light our party has done splendid work. In the capital, in Amsterdam, one of the focuses of liberal

capitalism, we got over 10,000 votes against 35,000 that were given to the Christian and liberal candidates together. Knowing that in our great cities—Amsterdam has over 550,000 inhabitants—only a tiny part of the great working class has a vote, everybody will recognize this as an important victory, especially as we obtained in this town by the former elections *far less than the half* of this number of social democratic votes.

So that we may conclude that we as yet have not had the famous "*Schweinglück*" that often enlightens the way of German social democracy; but that though everything was there to block our way, we held upright by the first ballot our red flag amidst the black flags of anarchists and clericals and the blue of the liberals and democrats of all sorts. And about one-tenth part of the Dutch people may be said to be on our side after the first elections that were held after the great strike. This may be called a triumph.

DAVID J. WYNKOOP.

Amsterdam, Holland, July, 1905.

Evolution of the Theory of Evolution.

(Continued.)

MATERIALIST monism had enabled Marx, Engels and Dietzgen to find a general key for the solution of all the riddles of the universe by means of inductive reasoning from experienced facts. The conscious and consistent application of this method on the part of Marx and Engels permitted them to realize the general evolution of nature and society by dialectic processes, to make a scientific forecast of industrial and political evolution, and to lay bare the mechanism of social evolution under capitalism by the discovery of the origin of surplus-value and the function of class-struggles. In the hands of Dietzgen, the same method produced a theory of understanding which established harmony between the human mind and the universe and solved all the difficulties which had been the stumbling blocks of scholastic and metaphysical philosophy for centuries, and which have remained insuperable obstacles for nearly every bourgeois scientist and philosopher until this day.

The vital truth and strength of dialectic materialism was quickly demonstrated by the fact that this philosophy became the accepted guide of millions of proletarians in all countries, who organized themselves for conscious co-operation in line with evolution. The bourgeois world, ignorant of the historical necessity of this new world-movement and its materialist monist philosophy, continued its heedless and headlong course of individualistic anarchy in thought and action. And when the new movement began to show its power, and press for an organization of social life in accord with higher evolution, the bourgeoisie opposed it with might and main as a danger to "law and order."

But the bourgeois scientists more or less consciously carried the method of dialectic materialism gradually into almost every department of their science. In the last half of the 19th century, the Marxian method was frequently plagiarized by bourgeois professors, especially in the field of sociology, economics and history, with the full knowledge of its original authorship and with the intention of robbing its author of his credit. But not one of the bourgeois plagiarizers or commentators equalled the proletarian master who had made a new departure in those sciences.

In other sciences, especially in biology, physiology, psychology, physics and chemistry, the combination of the dialectic method with science and natural philosophy led to a universal cor-

roboration of the general conclusions established by Marx, Engels and Dietzgen. In the course of the 19th century, nearly every science gradually made front against metaphysical dualism and worked its way towards materialist monism. But while the proletarian mind pursued its steady and conscious course along a consistent materialist monist road, the bourgeois mind never succeeded in fully divesting itself of metaphysical relics. Its class-environment proved too great a handicap for a complete emancipation from all vestiges of metaphysics.

In the beginning of the 19th century, the microscope began to exert its influence on philosophy by a succession of discoveries, which enabled scientists to abandon speculation for facts. The beginnings of the cell-theory, established by Grew in his "Anatomy of Plants," and the first description of the cell-nucleus by R. Brown, in the 17th century, now bore unexpected fruits. Schwann and Schleiden showed that all organic structures are built up of cells, and Van Mohl described a certain substance which forms the lining of cells and called it protoplasm. No one realized as yet that the essential basis for a mechanical explanation of life had thus been discovered.

But the microscope gave rise to an entirely new science, histology, the study of the microscopical structure of animal and plant tissue. Specialization became more and more an indispensable necessity for thorough research, and with the multiplication of special departments the need of correlation by means of philosophical generalization grew apace. Specialist science and natural philosophy thus became more and more indispensable to one another.

From the study of structure to that of function was the next logical step. Thus dialectics inevitably accompanied the new evolution of things in science.

As soon as this stage had been inaugurated, the battle against metaphysics and the survivals of Mosaic philosophy in natural science began to rage all along the line. Vitalism was compelled to reorganize its lines, even though no consistent theory of vital evolution had then become known. In 1833, Johannes Müller attempted to give a physical basis to this metaphysical theory, by comparing the physical processes in animals and man, in his "Handbook of the Physiology of Man." But this work was indirectly a proof of the untenability of the vitalist metaphysics. In spite of the dogged resistance of the old theories, the cell and protoplasm made themselves at home in the studies of bourgeois scientists, and produced in Virchow's "Cellular Pathology" a new departure in the study and treatment of diseases.

This was the time of physiological anatomy, and the work of Müller, Brücke, Helmholtz, Du Bois-Reymond and Ludwig in Germany, and of Claude Bernard in France, became the basis on

which their pupils in those two countries and in England, America, Denmark, Sweden, Italy and Japan built up the structure of modern physiology. In the course of this development, laboratories became a part of every well-equipped school and university.

Chemistry soon took part in this revolution and began to reproduce, by simple laboratory methods, many of the compounds which had been regarded as special products of a supernatural vital energy. Berthelot emphasized the growth of the tendency toward a uniform scientific method of research by declaring in his "*Mécanique Chimique*," that he intended to "introduce into the entire chemistry the same mechanical principles which already reign in the various departments of physics."

In 1846, Leverrier and Adams simultaneously and independently of one another discovered the planet Neptune and thereby reminded the scientists of the vast universe outside of their little specialties. This discovery was a new triumph for empirical science and another blow for revelation and metaphysics. For the existence of this planet had been proclaimed by mathematical astronomy long before it was actually observed by human eyes, and reactionary mysticism had, of course, scoffed at such "daring blasphemy."

Researches concerning the function of electricity, magnetism and light became more frequent, but led to no definite results until the latter half of the 19th century. In 1864, Clerk-Maxwell announced his electro-magnetic theory of light, but it was not until 1887 that Hertz demonstrated the actual existence of electric waves in the ether. In 1881 J. J. Thompson established the basis of the electro-dynamic theory, and in 1888 William Crookes advocated the theory of the formation of chemical elements from one primordial substance. He spoke of an "infinite number of immeasurably small ultimate—or rather ultimatissimate—particles gradually accreting out of the formless mist and moving with inconceivable velocity in all directions." Thus the 19th century reaffirmed on a more infinitesimal and refined scale the atomic theory of Democritus.

With the steady progress of this new tendency, Lamarckian ideas gained more and more favor in the eyes of the younger generation of scientists and found two able champions, about the middle of the 19th century, in Alfred R. Wallace and Charles Darwin. In 1859 Darwin's "*Origin of Species*" carried fresh dismay into the ranks of metaphysics and theology. Here was the irrefutable proof that Lamarck's ideas of descent and heredity were upheld by the facts of nature as occurring before our eyes in animals and plants. And in addition to these irrefutable facts, Darwin laid bare the mechanism by which natural evolution produced the various animal and plant species, which had so long been claimed as special creations. Without any guiding intellect,

without any preconceived purpose, by an apparent fortuitous natural selection, which, however, was the product of forces mutually controlling one another, nature was seen to produce its variety of forms by incessant interaction of forces, by a struggle of all organic forms against one another and with their environment, leading to the survival of those which were best equipped for this struggle by superior powers of adaptation to the conditions surrounding them. These produced an offspring well adapted to continue the struggle under the same conditions and in their turn to transmit their qualities to their progeny by means of heredity, while the organisms not well adapted to their conditions of life were eliminated from the line of evolution.

One of the most significant results of this transformist theory was that it wiped out the line of demarcation, not only between the various animal species, but also between animals and plants. In his first work, Darwin had left the question of man's descent open, from considerations of expediency. But when Wallace, Huxley, Haeckel and others showed that "in every visible character, man differs less from the higher apes than these do from the lower members of the same order," Darwin assented and came forth with his "Descent of Man," in which he indicated the evolution of man and the anthropoid apes from a common man-like ancestor.

Simultaneously with Wallace and Darwin, Herbert Spencer appeared upon the scene, supplementing and perfecting their work by a complete elaboration of the theory of organic evolution and tracing the struggle for existence through all its manifold aspects. In his "First Principles," he stated the general outline of the universal theory. In his "Principles of Biology," he applied it to the life of organisms. In his "Principles of Psychology," he furnished a comprehensive summary of the results of physiological psychology. And in his "Principles of Sociology," he presented the relations of this theory, as he understood it, to human society, activity and ideas in general. Although we are far from agreeing with Spencer on all points, as we shall presently show, we have no hesitation in saying that Spencer's works rank as high in the evolution of materialism as Hegel's do in idealism. The "Synthetic Philosophy" will always hold its place among the great works of the world.

In Darwin, Wallace and Spencer, dialectic materialism erected on English soil a landmark of its progress over speculative idealism. Although the dogmatism and bigotry of the entire reactionary world united in a furious assault upon their work, not one of their fundamental stones in the structure of evolution was injured by the attack. Metaphysics and theology had no weapons with which to defeat their materialist antagonist in open battle.

Vainly did Agassiz try to save personal creation and fixed species by his "Essay on Classification." Vainly did the most reactionary of churches set its learned men to work forging arguments against Lamarckian, Darwinian and Spencerian transformism. Instead of defeating the new ideas, even the Jesuit scientists that had not quite degenerated into spiritual obesity from lack of exercise of their reason became gradually "tainted" with transformist ideas, and finally the church itself sanctioned the greater part of the new ideas as divine creations and, as usual, sought to ruin by adoption what it could not conquer by force. And the palaeontological work of Agassiz himself compelled him to proclaim the fact of progressive changes in the organisms of each successive geological epoch.

By tracing the descent of man below the primates, the question of the evolution of man was not fully solved. It was merely stated in its correct form, and science could not rest satisfied and regard the Darwinian theories as proven, until it had located the transition forms between the common primeval ancestor of man and anthropoid apes and then followed the line of evolution as far back through the lower animals as human faculties would permit. It was palaeontology, embryology, comparative physiology and histology that became the most convincing witnesses for the mechanical origin and development of organisms. In the Neanderthal man, the Spy man, the Krapina man and the Pithecanthropus of Trinil, palaeontology supplied one by one the missing links between man, the anthropoid apes and their primitive common ancestor. At the same time, it gathered the proofs of the existence of similar types in the Tertiary age. Haeckel formulated his biogenetic law, which revealed the fact that individual development (ontogeny) is a condensed repetition of the race development (phylogeny), and that the embryos and newborn individuals resemble their ancestral types more closely than the adult parents. Then came Behring with his discovery that blood serum of horses treated with poison of diphtheria bacilli was an antidote and preventive of diphtheria, and Uhlenhuth found that blood transfusion furnished an infallible test for the close or remote relationship of animals. Uhlenhuth, Wassermann, Stern, Friedenthal and Nuttall continued these experiments and proved the blood relationship of man and the anthropoid apes.

In therapeutics and pathology, similar experiments led to the introduction, by Koch, Pasteur and others, of serous treatment, and the advance of chemistry supplied anaesthetics for surgical operations and robbed pain of its victims.

Comparative physiology, assisted by the biogenetic law and palaeontology, gradually traced the evolution of man from the common ancestor of man and primates down through some primitive species of lemurs (night monkeys), thence on through mar-

supials, duckbills, saurians, fishes, to ascidians. Then Haeckel advanced his gastrula theory and divided the lowest organisms into unicellular protozoa and protophyta and multicellular metazoa and metaphyta, bringing the descent of man down to some primordial common protist ancestor of animals and plants.

In Haeckel's "New History of Creation" and Boelsche's "Evolution of Man," the whole thread of evolution from the unicellular protoplasm to modern man is outlined so plainly that we can follow it from natural specimen to natural specimen and convince ourselves by a visit to any well-equipped museum of natural history of the reality of this outline.

In the sixties, Kirchhoff and Bunsen discovered spectral analysis and thus furnished science with another revolutionary instrument, by which the unity of the farthest fixed star with the rest of the universe was irrefutably demonstrated. Ethnology and the study of languages clearly established the unity of the human race. Natural science dominated all human thought and even found its way into political history in Buckle's "History of Civilization."

Once that the unity of all organisms in the world had been established, two questions immediately required an answer. One of them concerned the unity of psychological phenomena, the other that of life.

If the physiological development of mankind, animals and plants knows no line of demarcations, but only degrees of organization, and if psychology is in reality a branch of physiology, why should there be a line of demarcation between the psychological development of man, animals and plants? And if all organisms are descended from some common primordial protoplasmatic form, then the discovery of the origin of the vital processes of that form, or of any form, would solve the question of all organic life in the universe.

The answer of science to both questions was positive. Romanes, Haeckel and Jacques Loeb accumulated superabundant proofs for the physiological nature of the "soul" and the fundamental unity of the "soul" life of all organisms. The line of demarcation was gradually wiped out between mankind, animals and plants, also in psychology.

Romanes, in his "Mental Evolution of Animals and Man," pictured the growth of the "soul" from primitive beginnings to its present superb organization in the brain and nerve system of man. Haeckel in his "Soul Cells and Cell-Souls" demonstrated that the fundamental conditions of "soul" life were contained in every cell, whether it was a human, animal or plant cell. And Loeb showed convincingly that so-called intelligent or instinctive action does not depend on a supernatural, or even natural, centers of orientation or control, but on chemical and physical interac-

tions between the environment and the individual. The attraction toward the earth (geotropism), toward the light (heliotropism), toward solid bodies (stereotropism), and similar movements, in connection with electricity, magnetism, radiation and chemico-physical changes in the organism, explained all the intricate "soul" processes formerly attributed to supernatural intelligence or animal instinct. Hereditary transmission by means of simple natural processes in connection with use or disuse, produced the faculty of conscious memory in the higher organisms and led by imperceptible stages of gradation to the superior mind of man. The primitive line of psychic development has been outlined in popular language in Francé's "Germs of Mind in Plants."

The quest after the origin of life compelled science to penetrate far beyond so-called living organisms. It led on into the inorganic, and wiped out the line of demarcation between organic and inorganic, living and dead matter. It showed that organic life arose through the mechanical evolution of inorganic life. It revealed that life and death are but two poles of the same universe, that the distinction can no longer be between life and death, but only between different degrees of organization and intensity of life, between positive and negative life.

Personal immortality now resolves itself into personal evolution. Life and consciousness are now revealed as attributes of all matter, going through as many different stages of evolution as the various material forms in the universe. The personal immortality of any definite form would involve the control of all evolutionary processes which endanger the persistence of that form. So long as such a control is not established, there is a "transmigration of the soul," but not in the way that the mystics use this term. The physiological processes of a certain positive consciousness, or "soul," are simply converted by the process of "death," into negative consciousness, which in turn becomes the positive consciousness of some other form.

With Haeckel and Jacques Loeb a school of biologists has arisen, which marks a new stage in the revolution of the ideas concerning life and consciousness. This school has made the first steps toward a conscious control of the processes of life and consciousness, and the question of the control of these processes is within measurable distance of solution by means of laboratory methods. Loeb's works on tropisms and his "Comparative Physiology of the Brain and Comparative Psychology" are indispensable text-books for every sincere student of materialist monism.

Other sciences have likewise gone far on the road toward a conscious control of universal processes. Liebig's commercial chemistry inaugurated the realization of Berthelot's dream, who looked forward to a time when all human foodstuffs would be prepared in the laboratory and the drudgery of industrial and

agricultural labor eliminated. A new impetus was given to electric vacuum work in 1893-95 by the publication in Germany of the results of experiments made by Lenard and Röntgen, showing that certain rays of light, invisible to the human eye, penetrated substances, which had been considered impenetrable for light of any kind, and affected photographic plates. And in 1896, Becquerel, experimenting in France with phenomena of phosphorescence, showed that salts of uranium emit radiations, which penetrate opaque bodies, affect photographic plates and discharge an electrometer. Following close upon Becquerel's discoveries came the brilliant work of Mr. and Mrs. Curie on the radio-activity of bodies accompanying uranium (radium and helium).

Edison's phonograph, Marconi's and Tesla's experiments with wireless telegraphy, liquid air, the transmission of power by means of waterfalls or tides of the oceans, sun-motors, air-ships, color-photography, the ultra-microscope and similar discoveries and inventions, augur an impending revolution in methods of industrial activity, reducing the element of distance to a minimum, transforming manual labor into a superintendence of machines, and narrowing the domain of disease and death. Everywhere we see the coming of that conscious control of elements which Marx has foretold.

But here, where natural science touches elbows with social science, even the clearest of the bourgeois thinkers bears evidence to the force of environment by falling short of a complete monistic conception of evolution. For such a conception foreshadows the abolition of the ruling classes and the control of society by the working class. Even the most encyclopedic mind among the bourgeois transformists, the avatar of evolution, as he has been called, Herbert Spencer, admitted but grudgingly that the evolution of society tended inevitably toward socialism. And so enveloped was he in the prejudices of bourgeois individualism, in spite of his understanding of the trend toward socialization, in spite of the eloquent language of dialectic evolution which through his own mouth heralded the conscious interrelation of things, that he completely misapprehended the effects of the socialization and democratization of industry and bemoaned the sad fate of humanity under the "coming slavery." In ethics, his bourgeois horizon likewise did not permit him to arrive at a dialectic solution. He could not reconcile his biological and social ethics with his idea of the coming slavery.

The same criticism applies to Haeckel, who in many respects equals Spencer in his conception of evolution. Haeckel's monism is not free from class bias and metaphysical vestiges. He interpreted the struggle for existence with regard to man as an aristocratic principle, resulting in the selection of "the best," and declared that the "crazy ideas" of the socialists had nothing to do

with Darwinism. Forty years of socialist literature and activity in Germany have made little change in his opinions on this point. He has never realized that the struggle of man against nature is accompanied by the struggle of economic classes, and that the modern class-struggle between the working class and the capitalist class is a democratic principle, resulting in the organization of a new social environment, in which the struggle of classes shall be eliminated, and man unite all his social and individual forces for the struggle against nature. In his ethics he is as vague as Spencer, unable to reconcile his biological understanding of the physical basis of ethics with his views on sociology.

The logical result of this class bias is that notwithstanding all the efforts of Haeckel and others to establish a perfect monism, they are unable to escape from the contradictions inherent in the historical myopia of the bourgeoisie. Haeckel's works on monism, such as the "Riddle of the Universe," "Monism," or "The Wonders of Life," are sadly disfigured by sudden relapses into metaphysical language and thought. The same incongruities also vitiate the scientific discussions of bourgeois Darwinians, whenever the subject calls for an understanding of the dialectic nature of evolution, more especially an understanding of the peculiar nature of the human faculty of thought. The discussion of the continuity of the germ plasm and the transmission of hereditary characters by natural selection through the sole agency of this plasm in multicellular organisms, as advocated by Weismann, or of the mutation theory of De Vries, who tries to explain the sudden appearance of new varieties by the peculiar laws of crossing, would have produced far better results if the bourgeois scientists could have agreed on a consistent understanding of "natural selection," and if they could have risen sufficiently above their environment to grasp the full significance of materialist monism as revealed by Dietzgen's theory of understanding. As it is, they one-sidedly emphasize now this, now that, forgetting the wider interrelations of their subject, and this little shortcoming defeats all their efforts to disentangle themselves from the difficulties of their semi-metaphysical mode of reasoning. The tangle in the details of Darwinism and Spencerianism will not be straightened out until a socialist Darwinian will bring order out of this chaos, as Marx did out of bourgeois political economy.

This bourgeois handicap becomes especially apparent whenever the practical application of scientific understanding comes into conflict with the business organization of bourgeois society. A drastic illustration of this fact is furnished by the attempt to reform the department of criminology and introduce evolutionary methods into the treatment of the insane. When the revolution in psychology demanded a revision of the ideas concerning the free will and personal responsibility of criminals, the bourgeois

criminologist made vain efforts to bring their criminal codes into accord with the new facts without undermining their own juridical foundation. This became especially plain in Italy, where the ideas of Beccaria acted as a ferment and led to the rise of the so-called positive school of criminology, in the last quarter of the 19th century. Carrara, Pessina and even Lombroso strove vainly to overcome bourgeois environment by radical bourgeois criminology. They did not get farther away from mediaval methods and mass imprisonment than an imitation of the American system of solitary confinement would permit, with its corollary of sham justice. And they gave up in despair the attempt to find the dividing line between conscious and unconscious action, between completed and incompleted crime. It was not until Lombroso's disciple, Enrico Ferri, found his way into the field of historical materialism and socialism that the positive school of criminology was enabled to teach a monistic and evolutionary solution for the vexed question of social crime, by demanding the social prevention of crime instead of police repression. But Ferri does not indulge in any illusions as to the revolutionary role which the bourgeoisie may play in this question. He understands that the evolution into socialism is the only means of realizing his demand. His "Socialism and Criminality" and "Socialism and Modern Science" are gems of dialectic and monistic materialism.

It is a significant fact that not one of the numerous textbooks on psychology written by bourgeois professors for the use of universities takes frankly issue with the metaphysical rubbish of pseudo-science and espouses uncompromisingly the cause of materialist monism. And this is so for the same reason that no bourgeois professor teaches the Marxian theory of surplus-value and accepts its logical conclusions. The same reason prevents bourgeois Darwinians from accepting the facts of socialism. Darwin was at least honest enough to admit that he had not studied sociology and did not consider himself competent to judge of the merits of Marx's "Capital." But the modern Darwinians are not so modest. They ridicule the socialist philosophy before they have studied it. On the other hand, every socialist writer of note is a convinced Darwinian and Spencerian besides being a convinced Marxian. For this reason, the socialist Darwinians are alone able to reason in a consistent materialist monist way.

When in 1877 Lewis H. Morgan appeared with his main work, "Ancient Society," in which he demonstrated the blindness of his predecessors, Bachofen and McLennan, in the field of anthropology and disclosed the true nature of the primitive sexual organizations, it was the socialist Engels who rescued Morgan's work from oblivion and applied the new discoveries of Morgan concerning these primitive "gentes" with telling effect

to further historical research. In Engel's "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State," the connection between the dissolution of the primitive sex-organizations and the rise of private ownership of the essential means of production was laid bare, and the origin of the modern state as a result of this process clearly proven. And the socialist Cunow, in his "Sex-Organizations of Australian Aborigines," supplemented and perfected Morgan's work by additional studies.

Again, when bourgeois female emancipation started its painless crusade and hoped for the support of the equally painless bourgeois science, it was the socialist Bebel, who in his "Woman in the Past, Present and Future" demonstrated the weakness of bourgeois science and reminded bourgeois women that female emancipation was a process of evolution and could be accomplished only through the proletarian class-struggle.

And finally, when the bourgeois psychologists kept turning around their own axis in the vain endeavor to find a monistic formulation for the new psychological facts, it was the socialist Engels, who in his "Anti-Duhring" showed that the dialectic process pervaded society and nature, and the socialist Josef Dietzgen, who in his "Outcome of Philosophy" perfected his materialistic monism by demonstrating that the universe is an organism and the infinite cause and effect of everything, including itself and the human faculty of thought, or "soul."

But bourgeois minds will as soon accept the socialist philosophy as a camel will go through a needle's eye, or a rich man go to jail. So the bourgeois science gropes along as best it may in its half-hearted monism which is not monism, continues the fruitless discussion of semi-metaphysical *functions, forces, or faculties*, and leaves much room for the speculations of pseudo-scientific occultism. With *functions, forces and faculties*, all manner of miracles are performed by spiritualists, mental scientists, theosophists and other votaries of the mystic. But what do these terms signify? What is, for instance, the faculty (function, force) of thought?

Labor is a function of labor-power. Labor-power is the latent (potential) energy of the human body, and it performs its function by converting this potential energy into kinetic energy, or motion. Quite analogically, thinking is a function of the faculty of thought. This faculty is the labor-power of the human brain, the latent energy of the protoplasmic system of the human body. The brain performs its function by converting its latent energy into motion, or thought, in response to all the stimuli sent to it by way of the protoplasmic system. This function is a labyrinth of objective reactions and subjective counter-reactions. It is all this as a part of the entire natural universe, and it is nothing else. The difference between conscious and unconscious, or

subconscious, thought is purely one of the intensity of stimuli and reaction. And when physio-chemical biology will have analyzed this labyrinth of processes, traced its fundamental reactions in the laboratory and connected them with the final source of all, the universe, man will know all that his faculty of thought can find out about itself and other riddles of the universe.

This conception of the universe and of the human soul is diametrically opposed to metaphysical and theological dualism. Truly does Haeckel cry out: "An honest and objective observation of these obvious antagonisms makes their reconciliation impossible. Either an understanding of nature and experience, or the fables of belief and revelation!"

But a scientific theory of understanding implies the recognition of the socialist philosophy. And the only element which is conscious striving for the realization of this philosophy is the class-conscious proletariat of the world.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

(THE END.)

(This series of articles is about to be published in book form, as a part of the "Library of Science for the Workers," under the title "Science and Revolution." The book will also contain two additional chapters applying the historical material to present conditions.—EDITOR.)

Concerning Sacrifices.

I caught my flesh saying to my soul that it had made some sacrifices for Truth's Cause.

Astounded I stood in silence.

Flesh finally shamed to silence, Soul flamed forth,—identifying me with Flesh:

"Thou art aflame with love and zeal for this great Cause?

"Let's estimate the *sacrifices*, O thou strident boaster of bestowals!

"One *might* have loved his enemies with such all-mastering love as would have won them to the life-long service of the Cause.

"One *might* have borne the base betrayals of his Judases with manliness so manifestly love-inspired that Judas had survived and stood unflinchingly through future flames—a great evangel for Truth's Cause.

"One *might* with little effort have been martyred for e'en a half-way truthful cause—have let the free-shed blood be seed for something mightier than a church in love-bestowal, uplift, saving-power (in Time) producing men from a brute beast soil.

"One *might*, with mightier consecration, have accomplished Truth's commands. With perfect consecration this could be, *and not one sacrifice then call to Truth for recognition or expected recompense.*

"One might at least have starved, gone naked or scant clothed, never rested night or day through unremembered years for such a Cause."

* * * * *

"Instead, thou standest shamed, alive, with little done, thought not too hardly of by rivaling plutocrats, rulers, priests, parsons, church-deacons, elders and the sort! contributing a dole *at times* that never caused one lack of comfort in thy full, well-fed, well-clothed, well-sheltered life——

"*Thou!* and speaking of a sacrifice, *to Truth!*!"

"*Thou and standing shamed before thy Soul!*"

Thus flamed my soul illuminating words before the startled senses cowering in shame, silenced, paralyzed with perfect comprehension of the past.

Come, Comrade, let the accusation stand, said I to Flesh; *forthwith let us accomplish Truth's commands.*

* * * * *

O CAUSE BELOVED, THE DAY OF PERFECT CONSECRATION IS AT HAND.

—EDWIN ARNOLD BRENHOLTZ.

At The Live-Oaks, Turnersville, Texas.

Value and Surplus Value.

(Continued.)

TRUE to his method of "no philosophy," Marx set about his task of finding the true laws of exchange-value in the most "unphilosophic," matter-of-fact way. He argued that, while the laws of value furnish the key to the understanding of our economic system, those laws themselves can only be derived from the observation of the actual every-day facts of our production and distribution. In order, however, that these facts may be properly understood and appreciated they must be examined in their historical connection and in their proper historical setting.

The production and distribution of the capitalist system can be best studied by an examination of a typically capitalistic commodity; A Factory Product. While the capitalist system has impressed itself upon every phase of life of every society in which it prevails, so that nothing can escape it, whether it properly belongs within its domain or not, its characteristic features, its vital elements, are contained in their purity and simplicity only in its historic embodiment,—the factory product. The factory product is not only the historic form of capitalist production, accompanying its appearance on the historical arena as its technical embodiment, but it represents the vast majority of all the commodities of capitalist society. The factory product bears the imprint of capitalism so deeply emblazoned upon it, and is so free from entangling alliances with any forms of production other than capitalistic, that there can be absolutely no mistaking its origin and virtues. Not so with other products. Take, for instance, a farm product. You can not, by the manner of its production, tell whether it was produced under the capitalistic regime or not. This is due to the fact that our form of ownership and cultivation of land have to a great extent remained far behind the general progress of our economy. We cannot, therefore, by examining a farm product tell the characteristics of capitalist productions, for we cannot tell which of the properties of the farm product are the result of capitalism and which are the survival of some prior mode of production. After we shall have learned to know the characteristics of capitalist production, we shall see that these characteristics are to be found also in the capitalistically produced farm product. The examination of the farm product may, therefore, serve to find

out the limits of the laws of capitalistic production, but not these laws themselves. For that purpose we must study the factory product.

It is well to remember in this connection that historically the capitalist system has built its foundation on the ruins of farming. That their progress is usually in the inverse ratio, to each other. It is one of the contradictions of capitalist society, that while it needs farm products in order to sustain itself, farming does not fit into its scheme. In such typically capitalistic countries as England, for instance, this contradiction was solved by practically eliminating farming, and drawing its food supply from abroad. But as this is an obviously impossible solution for the whole capitalistic world, attempts have been made to capitalize farming. So far, this has met with only indifferent success. That is why the "agrarian question" is now uppermost in all economic discussions. From all this it is perfectly plain that if we want to understand the capitalistic system we must study the factory product.

The chief characteristic feature of the factory product as a natural phenomenon, that which marks its contrast to the farm product, is its comparative independence of climatic and other natural phenomena—an independence which makes it practically reproducible at will. Unlike the farm product, which depends for its successful production on the varying conditions of soil and climate, conditions usually not subject to change at the hands of man, and therefore limited in its production by a force to which all men must bow, the factory product knows no other superior but man who reproduces it at will. The limits of the production of the factory product are not given by nature, but imposed by man; production of the factory product increases or slackens in accordance with the demands of the "market;" that is to say, its limits are set by the relations of the members of society in the distribution of the manufactured product among themselves. In this it typifies the capitalist system. With the advent of the capitalist system poverty and riches have ceased to be a natural condition; they have become a social relation.

Let us, then, take the factory product and follow its natural course in life; let us examine the manner of its production, the course it takes in the circulation of goods to the point of its ultimate destination,—consumption; let us see who are the persons participating in its production, instrumental in its circulation and sharing in its distribution.

In thus writing the biography of any factory product we will find that its life history will read as follows:

It was produced in a large factory building owned or hired by the manufacturer. It was made by a large number of workmen hired by the same manufacturer, who paid them for

their labor, out of materials provided for by the manufacturer, and by means of machinery owned by him. After our factory product was ready for use it was shipped to a wholesale dealer, who bought it from the manufacturer, and who, in turn, sold it to a retail dealer. From the retail dealer it went to the consumer, who purchased it from him. This is the usual course. There are, however, variations of this course. The wholesale dealer may, for instance, have been omitted, if the manufacturer sells direct to the retailer; or, there may have been a good deal more of buying and selling done in it before it finally reached the consumer. One thing is sure, however, its life-course led through these three stages: manufacture, trade, consumption.

The persons who met in this, its life-course, who affected its existence and its different changes, and who participated in its distribution in one way or another, besides those who participated in the production and distribution of the raw material from which it was made, which may itself have been a factory product, are: The laborer who produced it and was paid for it; the manufacturer who caused it to be produced, paid the cost of its production, and who received the purchase price from the trader who bought it from him; the merchant who bought it at one price and resold it at another, pocketing the difference; and, finally, the consumer, who paid for it and kept it for consumption, either personal, non-productive or impersonal, productive consumption in the manufacture of some other factory product. There may have been others: the manufacturer may have paid rent for his premises to the landlord or interest for his capital to the banker; the trader may have paid rent, interest, or for help; there may have been a lot of time and labor spent in transporting it from place to place until it finally reached its place of ultimate destination, the consumer—and all of this had to be paid for.

All these persons who participated in the production or circulation of our factory product, and all those with whom they must "divvy up," must share in our factory product, that is to say, in the price which the ultimate consumer paid for it. Let us see how it is done.

We must, of course, as already pointed out in the preceding article, assume that each gets what is due him, under our present system, as they are all presumed to be honest, and the cases of one getting advantage of the other are exceptional, and they are all free agents working without compulsion. The workingman is "free" to work or not to work, so is the manufacturer and merchant to hire, buy and sell. The capitalist system needs for its proper development, and we therefore assume, absolute freedom, personal and commercial. How, then, is the share of each determined, when is it produced and when paid over?

It must always be remembered that none of those interested in the production, circulation and distribution of the factory product, have any interest whatever in its existence, or desire for its possession. None of them gets any share of it physically. Their distributive share comes out of the purchase price paid for it by its ultimate consumer, who takes it out of the "market," converts it from a commodity into an ordinary good possessing only its natural qualities of a use-value. In other words, each of their distributive shares comes of the exchange-value of the commodity which is turned into the universal medium of exchange—money—by its sale to the ultimate consumer.

This exchange-value first manifests itself when the manufacturer has the commodity ready for sale and places it on the market for which it was produced. The manufacturer produced it not for its use-value,—he never had any personal use for it and never intended to use it,—but for its exchange-value, and as soon as it is ready in exchangeable form he offers it for sale or exchange. He sells it, again, to somebody who has absolutely no personal use for it and does not intend to use it himself, but buys it just as the manufacturer manufactured it, because of the exchange-value there is in it, and which, by the way, for some reason or other, he expects to be more than what he pays for it.

On this first manifestation of the exchange-value of the factory-produced commodity the manufacturer gets in exchange for it a certain sum of money or other commodities, the price obtained on its sale or exchange. The exchange value of the commodity has realized itself in his hands in the form of its price.

We must not, however, confuse price with value. Value is something which the commodity possesses when placed upon the market and before any price is paid for it, and it is because of this value that the price is paid for it. The value is the cause of the price. Furthermore, value and price do not always coincide in amount. The price of an article may be greater or less than its value, according to circumstances. The proof of this is the fact that things may be bought "cheap" or "dear," that is to say, for a price above or below their value. If the price of a thing and its value were the same, nothing could be bought either cheap or dear, because the price paid would be its value. The fact that we speak of things as being bought or sold "cheap" or "dear" proves that our valuation of the thing is something outside of the price, and therefore something with which the price may be compared and proved either too high or too low. It is, therefore, manifest that value and price are not only not identical in their nature, but that they do not always

even coincide in amount. And this, notwithstanding the fact that value is the cause of price. The reason for it is easily discovered. Value is a social relation and is therefore determined by social conditions, whereas price is an individual valuation and is therefore determined by individual motivation. Value being the cause of price, the chief motive of the individual making the price, will, of course, be the value of the thing priced. This does not mean, however, the actual value of the thing, but his idea of its value. Whether this idea will be a correct estimate of the actual value of the thing depends, of course, on a number of individual circumstances and conditions. Besides this chief motive, again, there may be a number of subsidiary motives, all being either directly individual in their character, or individual estimates of social conditions or relations. All this produces what is called the "haggling of the market." As a result of this haggling comes the price actually paid for the article, and the average of the prices paid makes the market price.

This price is purely accidental within certain limits, being the result of individual volitions based on individual estimation. It is so within certain limits only, for it is controlled by its primary cause,—value—which sets the standard by which it is measured and to which it naturally tends to conform, and will conform the more the nearer to the truth are the individual estimates of the social relations and conditions, and the freer the individual motivations are from purely personal considerations. Value is the norm about which the "haggling" of the market takes place, and the price which results from this "haggling" naturally gravitates towards its norm-value. Price will be "cheap" or "dear" according to whether it is, in the estimation of the person making the valuation, below or above the actual value of the thing.

What is this social element, this social relation, which gives a commodity its value? A careful search will reveal only one element common to all commodities, which is social in its character and is capable of giving commodities the value which will express the social relations of production, and that is—*Human Labor*. The production of the typically capitalist commodity, the factory product, is wholly a question of the application of human labor, physical or mental, and its results merely a question of the quantity and quality of the human labor expended. It is this labor which gives the product its value. It is by the expenditure of this labor that its value is measured. It is as the embodiment of a certain quantity—quality of human labor that the finished product is placed upon the market for sale, and it is as such that it is exchanged for another commodity, or the universal commodity, money. In making a sale or ex-

change the parties estimate the respective quantities of labor contained in the articles exchanged or in the articles sold and the price given, and if one finds them to be equal or to preponderate in his own favor he makes the bargain. The question of quality is also regarded as a question of quantity, labor of a higher nature being reduced to its simple form of ordinary average labor of which it represents a larger quantity.

It must be borne in mind, however, that, value being a social phenomenon based on social conditions and relations, it is not the labor which happens to be accidentally contained in any given commodity, as the result of some individual conditions or circumstances under which its producer worked, that gives the commodity its value, but the socially necessary labor therein contained. In other words, the value of a commodity is not derived from the particular labor actually put into its production, nor from the amount of labor actually expended upon its production, but from the amount of average human labor which it is necessary for society to expend for its production. The mere expenditure of labor on the production of any article does not make that article a commodity having exchange value. It is social expenditure of the labor, that is, its expenditure for the purposes of social productions, of the production for society of things which are useful for it, that makes the article produced a commodity having exchange-value. The expenditure, therefore, in order to create value must be necessary in accordance with the social relations and conditions existing at the time the valuation is made. This includes a variety of considerations, only the most important of which can be noted here.

To begin with, "socially necessary" labor must not be confused with "average" labor. The average of labor only comes into play when the productive power of individual producers working with the same tools is under consideration. Otherwise, "socially necessary" and "average" may, and very often do, represent different things. For instance, the labor expended on the production of an article, in order to create new value, must, in addition to having been productive according to the average expenditure for the production of such articles, have created something which was necessary for society. In determining whether an article is "necessary" for society or not, it is not merely the general usefulness of the article and its actual necessity for some of the members of society that is to be considered, but also, whether, in the state of the society's economy, the need for such articles has not already been provided for sufficiently when compared with other needs, and having due regard to the general conditions of production and distribution in society. If too much of a certain commodity is produced, too much not absolutely, but according to existing social conditions and rela-

tions, such production does not create any additional value. It is so much labor wasted. Of course, that does not mean that any particular labor thus expended will create no value, or that any particular article thus produced will have no value. But, value being a social relation, all the labor expended in the production of this class of articles in society will produce less value proportionately, each article will have so much less value, so that the aggregate of such articles produced will have no more value than if that labor were not expended and the additional article were not produced.

Again,—the tools of production in a certain industry may be undergoing a change by which the amount of labor necessary to be expended in the production of a certain article is reduced. During the period of transition the “average” amount of labor expended on the production of the article will be considerably above the amount necessary for its production by means of the new tools and considerably below that of the old, for the average is made up of the articles produced by means of both the old and the new tools in so far as they are being used. The value of the commodities produced, however, will not be measured by the average expenditure of labor, but either by that of the old or that of the new methods. If the new method has not yet been sufficiently perfected, so that it can not as yet supply the needs of society, then the valuation will be in accordance with the old method; if it has been so perfected, then in accordance with the new method. If, between the time of the production of an article and its valuation in the market, the new tools have attained the required degree of efficiency, the value of this article, whether produced by the old or the new method, will change from the valuation in accordance with the old method, which was socially necessary at the time of production, to that in accordance with the new method, which is that now socially necessary.

In other words, the value of a commodity is determined by the amount of labor which society will necessarily have to expend for its production when it requires it. That is to say, by the amount of labor socially necessary for its *reproduction*.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)

Evolution by Mutation.

PROF. HUGO DE VRIES of the University of Amsterdam has been pursuing a series of investigations, the results of which he has published in a recent work, * which in many ways presents some of the most important contributions that have been made to the theory of evolution since the writings of Darwin. The author himself disclaims all originality. He says: "My work claims to be in full accord with the principles laid down by Darwin, and to give a thorough and sharp analysis of some of the ideas of variability, inheritance, selection and mutation, which were necessarily vague at his time." While the fact of the origin of species by evolution is now universally accepted by men of science, and generally ignored in the reasoning of most bourgeois editorial writers, yet the methods by which it operates are still very much in dispute. The question of how new species originate for "natural selection" to "select" has always been considered one of the weak points in the theory.

"On this point Darwin has recognized two possibilities. One means of change lies in the sudden and spontaneous production of new forms from the old stock. The other method is the gradual accumulation of those always present and ever fluctuating variations which are indicated by the common assertion that no two individuals of a given race are exactly alike. The first changes are what we now call mutations, the second are designated as 'individual variations,' or as this term is often used in another sense, as 'fluctuations.'"

Of late years, owing largely to the influence of Wallace, all the emphasis has been laid upon the slow gradual evolution through a succession of minute fluctuations. De Vries, on the other hand, announces as the purpose of his book:

"I intend to give a review of the facts obtained from plants which go to prove the assertion, that species and varieties have originated by mutation, and are, at present, not known to originate in any other way."

The question of what constitutes a species must first be determined, and he concludes that "any form which remains constant and distinct from its allies in the garden is to be considered as an elementary species." Once that such a species has been established he shows that no amount of selection can make any great change. For a short time selections of the best specimens within the species produce startling results, but this process soon reaches its limit. He shows, by a host of illustrations drawn from the

* "Species and Varieties, their Origin by Mutation," by Hugo de Vries. Open Court Publishing Co., cloth 865 pp., \$5.00 net.

sugar beet, double flowers, cane sugar, and other long cultivated plants, that practically no improvements have been made for centuries, although the species have in some cases been subject to the closest and most scientific selection. Neither do great changes in the environment produce corresponding permanent changes in the species, as is shown by experiments with Alpine and desert varieties, which, after having been subjected to the peculiar selective action of the extraordinary environment presented on high mountains and deserts, for centuries, will revert to the ordinary lowland or humid type in the life of a single individual. The great variety found in some cultivated species seems to be due rather to the original selection of greatly varying types, than to the effects of subsequent selection. (On all these points it is impossible to cite any portion of the wealth of evidence accumulated in support of the positions stated).

While this constant state of the species is the normal one, yet there come times when great and sudden fluctuations take place, which give rise to permanent distinct species. These are what he calls "mutations." These mutations are sharply distinguished from "fluctuations" such as constantly occur in all living things. He says concerning "fluctuations":

"Their essential character is the heaping up of slight deviations around a mean, and the occurrence of continuous lines of increasing deviations, linking the extremes within this group. Nothing of the kind is observed in the case of mutations. There is no mean for them to be grouped around, and the extreme only is seen, and it is wholly unconnected with the original type."

Over and over he points out that there are no stepping stones between the new and the old. There is no succession of stages that can be pointed out. Nor do the new species show any signs of reversion to type. Its fluctuations are around a new mean, and not around that of the parent from which it sprang.

A large amount of material had been accumulated in support of this position before actual experimentation proved it. Many new species were shown to have suddenly appeared at different points, which showed no close line of variations between them and neighboring plants of the older species. Yet it was always possible to claim that these might have come from some previously existing, but hitherto undiscovered species. Finally, however, in an experiment with the evening primrose (*Oenothera Lamarckiana*) new species were produced under all the restrictions of laboratory experimentation. From one and the same lot of seeds, all taken from a single existing species showing no variations in the direction of wide fluctuations, five new species were produced. These were distinct in every way, well marked, permanent and showed no signs of reversion to type.

Sufficient has already been determined about this method of

evolution to make it possible to formulate some of the laws of mutations.

"The first law is, that new elementary species appear suddenly, without intermediate steps."

The second law is that

"New forms spring laterally from the main stem." They may leave the old species unaffected and generally do, but a few individuals seeming to be affected by the mutating principle. At the same time several new species may spring into life at once.

III. "New elementary species attain their full constancy at once."

Several other laws are given, but these are the more important. "It is readily granted that the constant condition of species is the normal one, and that mutating periods must be the exception." He does not attempt to determine what it is that gives rise to this condition of mutability, but he makes a couple of almost startling suggestions:

We may search for mutable plants in nature, or we may hope to induce species to become mutable by artificial methods. The first promises to yield results most quickly, but the scope of the second is much greater, and it may yield results of far more importance. Indeed, if it should once become possible to bring plants to mutate at our will, and perhaps even in arbitrarily chosen directions, there is no limit to the power we may finally hope to gain over nature.

In this connection he makes the following observations:

The amount of mutability and its possible directions may be assumed to be due to internal causes. The determination of the moment at which they will become active can never be the result of internal causes. It must be assigned to some external factor, and as soon as this is discovered the way for experimental investigation is open.

Summing up the results of this very hasty survey, we may assert that species remain unchanged for indefinite periods, while at times they are in the alternative condition. Then at once they produce new forms, often in large numbers, giving rise to swarms of subspecies. All facts point to the conclusion that these periods of stability and mutability alternate more or less regularly with one another.

This theory at once meets the only two objections to the theory of evolution that have ever been worthy of consideration. One of these was the question of the origin of the variations to be selected, the other was the time objection.

"If evolution does not proceed any faster than what we can see at present, and if the process must be assumed to have gone on in the same slow manner always, thousands of millions of years would have been needed to develop the higher types of animals and plants from their earliest ancestors."

The physicists have shown that no such time has elapsed since life appeared on earth. The estimates now run from twenty to sixty million years for the period of life. The mutation theory of course at once disposes of this argument, and therefore fits in with the evidence from geology and paleontology.

The importance of this modification of the accepted theory

of evolution to the socialist should be at once apparent. The pseudo-scientist has always been quoting at us, that "there are no sudden leaps in nature." While this has already been overthrown in geology, and numerous other fields, yet this victory in the field of biology is much more significant. It will be noticed how closely this theory fits in with the socialist doctrine of the class-struggle, according to which there is a long period of slow growth with slight variations (or reforms) followed by a sudden change of social character (called revolution) brought about by the accession of a new social class to power. Nor is this analogy without significance. The universality of natural law is one of the fundamental premises of modern science, and the best work in sociology at the present time is being done by those who are extending the law of other sciences into the more complete field of society.

A. M. SIMONS.

EDITORIAL

Science and the Workers.

A great change is going on in the systematized portion of human knowledge known as science. In the early days science was welcomed by the bourgeoisie as a means of discovering new dyes, new materials, new machines, in short new sources of power, production and profits. But when Darwin, Wallace and Marx showed how scientific methods might be applied on a wider scale the industrial rulers sought to shut up science once more, as it had been imprisoned in the middle ages. The expensive laboratories functioned very well as a cloister and the technical jargon of the *savant* was well nigh as unintelligible as Medieval Latin. A "public opinion" to correspond arose among the scientists. They came to believe it undignified to speak in language that the laity could comprehend. The necessity for division of labor was exaggerated into a virtue. The "specialist" whose work only a half dozen could understand became the ideal in the scientific world. A vast multitude of imaginary divisions called classifications were run through the universe of facts. These imaginary lines soon came to be looked upon as real natural boundaries separating the world into little plots each having its own peculiar laws and phenomena. Science, like all the rest of the capitalist world, was individualized. To generalize across these line-fences became almost as great a crime as to popularize scientific investigation; both were "unprofessional."

Natural events were supposed to move in a manner suited to their exclusive dignity. There were no sudden changes. "Catastrophies" were abolished from geology; "Transformations" of all kinds from biology, and of course, revolutions were excluded from history. Soon, however, the facts themselves began to play havoc with this artificial structure. A Krakatoa would explode in spite of geological theories, in the same way that revolutions had taken place, historians to the contrary notwithstanding. Natural laws and phenomena were found to pay very little attention to the scientific line-fences. Most horrible of all, scientists were forced to recognize that the most valuable facts for many fields of

science were those most obvious and whose observation required neither the trained technique of the specialists, nor the expensive laboratories of the universities. Furthermore, that it was the great general laws which correlated and explained these most general facts that were of great value, rather than the minute dissection of the strange and unusual. Along with this came, also the knowledge that science itself was becoming stifled within its bonds. With only a handful of persons who could understand the specialist, his own growth was limited until he became bigoted, egotistic and the opposite of scientific. A wide appreciative, comprehending clientele was found to be essential to any real growth of knowledge. So it was that "popularization" from being "unscientific" come to be recognized as an absolute essential of any true science.

It can not be too often repeated that the breaking down of division lines is one of the most prominent characteristics of the new scientific revolution. A London scientist has proven that the sensations of living matter, which botanists had already shown existed in plants as well as animals have at least an analogy in what has hitherto been called the inorganic world. Then comes the son of Charles Darwin to show that the great laws which his father discovered in the field of biology are operative in physics and chemistry. So it has come about that the line between the organic and the inorganic is being well nigh wiped out with the result that all science is forced to think in terms of materialism. But if these laws reach back through life, through man and plant to metals they also reach forward or upward into that most complex of all organisms, society. This is now recognized by practically every sociologist, entitled to the name, be his point of view bourgeoisie or proletarian.

For us, however, the significant fact is that this science in its conclusions affords an inexhaustible arsenal of weapons for the working class in their struggle to better themselves.

Every new discovery in the field of science seems to bring new support to the doctrines of socialism. There are two great fundamental laws which seem to underlie the whole field of science. One of these is the law that only the necessary happens. In the field of biology, for instance, it has long ago been seen that nature is very economical of her material. Only those things that tend to further survival are permitted to survive. Consequently all organs are determined by the necessity of getting a living, which after all is but the biological statement of the economic interpretation of history.

The other great law that makes its presence felt at every point in the the field of science is the law of change. That nothing is, but everything is becoming. Evolution after all is really nothing but the general name of all the laws that govern this change. Science is today, therefore, to a large extent a study of the rules and methods by which change is brought about. When we realize that changes are accomplished in much the same manner throughout the whole world of phenomena,—physical, chemical, biological or social, it should become evident at once of how tre-

mendous importance are all the facts discovered by modern science for the sociologist.

Many of these points are elaborated further in the articles by Comrade Untermann that have been running through the REVIEW for some time. Still more are accessible in the series of works on science, whose publication is announced elsewhere.

The important fact, however, is that the sociology of the future must draw its laws to a large extent from the field of physical and biological science. This is necessary partly because of the priority of these earlier fields of investigation, partly because of their great simplicity, which makes their examination easier. For the socialist this field is especially fruitful since it constantly adds to his efficiency as the opponent of the existing order. There is no work that will yield such rich returns in valuable information for the Socialist worker as the study of natural science.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

There have been many strong objections raised to the recent alliance of the socialists with the clericals in Bavaria, although this alliance was for the purpose of furthering the cause of universal suffrage which is always admitted to be the one issue which will most palliate any sort of compromising tactics. Nevertheless the socialists of other countries as well as many of those in Germany feel that nothing whatever would justify even a temporary alliance with the reactionary clericals. The French socialists have been particularly bitter against these tactics. The by-elections which have just taken place in Germany have not shown any great increase in the socialist vote, and indeed in many places there was considerable of a falling off. In some countries this is laid to the reaction against parliamentarism, others claim it is due to the natural reaction following the great effort of 1903.

A very bitter discussion is now being carried on between Kautsky and the editor of the Berlin "*Vorwaerts*" in regard to the attitude of the party toward the general strike. It is probable that much of the attention of the next congress of the German party, which meets on the 17th of September at Jena, will be occupied with the discussion of this question.

ITALY.

The socialist union of Rome has expelled seven quite prominent members of the organization for having voted for liberal candidates at the last municipal election. Four of these were connected with the editorial staff of *Avanti* at the time when Bissolati was dominating the policy of the party in Rome.

SPAIN.

Spain is passing through a most acute industrial crisis which is making itself felt, especially in the agricultural districts. As a result, there have been numerous uprisings with considerable bloodshed. So long as the proletariat remains so close to the subsistence point, and industrial development is at so low a stage, social movements are largely violent and unintelligent. However, there are the germs of a socialist movement which may be hoped to make the national revolutionary attitude of the Spanish intelligently effective.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

Those Socialists who are connected with the trade union movement, and who have patiently endeavored in recent years to interest their fellow-workers in their political principles, are surely having a merry time of it, and it begins to look as though, since the launching of the so-called Industrial Workers of the World, confusion will become worse confounded. It was none other than the irrespressible and rejuvenated Prof. Daniel DeLeon who invented a new name for the Socialists in the trade unions, and since the distinction has been made and for convenience sake it will probably be accepted. Thus we regretfully drop the old appellation, of which we were once quite fond, of "kangaroo" and pin on the new badge and shining mark, "pure and simple Socialist." As intimated, the p. and s. Socialists are having a lively experience in side-stepping the blows that are coming from every direction and returning a few for company's sake. In the first place, the double-headed capitalistic bunch, marshalled by Parry and Post on one wing and Belmont and Easley on the other, have labored in season and out to discourage the spread of Socialism in the trade unions. Parry and Post have sought to arouse the prejudice and antagonism of the anti-Socialists by charging outright that the organizations have become Socialistic and approve of confiscation, physical force, etc. Belmont and Easley have set themselves up as guardians of the unions, and through their official organ they are assuring the world that organized labor has no sympathy for Socialism, and that the Socialists in the unions are of little importance anyhow. From another direction come the attacks of the old conservatives, led by Sam Gompers. In his organ, the Federationist, Gompers has been making a steady campaign for some time against socialism and Socialists of every stripe. That the "Little Napoleon," has been striking over the back of the Industrial Workers of the World at the Socialists in his own army is undoubted when his bald misrepresentations are thoroughly analyzed. Gompers' scheme has been to throw the Socialists in the unions upon the defensive and force them to bear the blame for every sin of omission and commission of every Socialist in the land. In this manner he hopes to destroy whatever influence his opponents in the unions may have and perpetuate his policies and himself in office. Gompers' tactics are closely followed in a number of national organizations, and even in local and central bodies the lines between the conservative and radical elements are quite clearly drawn. Then from a third point comes a perhaps more vicious onslaught than any other, namely, the attacks that are made by little bands of crooks and grafters who have an unconquerable desire to use the trade unions for corrupt purposes. These schemers hate the Socialists because the latter have become strong enough pretty much the country over to block the old game of endorsing boodle politicians and parties as "working-

man's friends," and thus an important source of revenue has been destroyed. The grafter doesn't fight openly and upon questions of principle. He works under cover, sneaks about and puts in a knock here and a mysterious insinuation there, and the dirtier he is the louder he proclaims his virtues as a trade unionist. Every labor skate that I have ever known, from Pomeroy, Weissmann, White, Parks and their like down to the most obscure ward-heeler in a backwoods village, has been a strenuous and enthusiastic advocate in favor of "keeping politics out of the union" and kicking out the Socialists. From a fourth direction we are forced to meet the hostility of those who have fed upon their hatred for individuals and organizations to such an extent that they have become unbalanced and run amuck and would now down everybody but those who follow them. I refer to that peculiar band of fanatics that have become generally known as deleonites. It is unnecessary here to give an extended description of this faction or its methods. They are pretty well known. Captained by a crafty conspirator—who has been a howling failure in the single tax movement, the old K. of L., in the so-called Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, and who has all but ruined the old Socialist Labor party of membership and vote polled—this scattered band of disruptionists take peculiar delight in denouncing and villifying the "pure and simple Socialists" above all others. Their attack has not been directed so much at the common enemy, the capitalist, or even the old conservatives of the labor movement, but their main efforts have been aimed at destroying the Socialist party. It has become a craze with them, and their interpretation of the class struggle has been to demolish "the party of many aliases" and the pure and simple unions, and only then will the field be cleared to put the capitalist system out of business. They have obstinately and blindly butted their heads against a stone wall so persistently that they were practically out of existence, when suddenly the Chicago conference is held and they succeed in engrafting themselves upon the new Industrial Workers of the World, and now they are actually making the claim that their methods have been endorsed and with their accustomed brazenness are asserting their right to lead the whole show. Back about ten years ago, when Prof. DeLeon launched his freak Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, the edict soon went forth that every Socialist in a trade union who refused to fall upon his knees and worship the new calf was a traitor, a fakir and should be "kicked out." Now the fellow has the impudence to renew his ridiculous and bombastic command, and whosoever refuses to withdraw from the trade unions and join the "Industrialists" becomes an object of suspicion and a mark for slander and villification. Talk about intrigue and double-dealing to sow the seeds of dissension! The adventurous professor is a past master at the game, and it seems that a great many thoughtless and unsophisticated union men and Socialists are mere putty in his grasp. The day that De Leon has long prayed for has come at last. The Socialist party can be split! Note the manner in which he cunningly attempts to make a distinction between the "Kangaroos," who smashed his dishonest schemes and whom he naturally hates and the original Social Democrats he ridiculed and now pretends to admire. Note how this arch-conspirator juggles with and strings together the names "Debs, De Leon and Hagerty" in his personal organ, hoping thereby to create enmities between the Eastern Socialists, who detest the conspirator and everybody who attempts to succor him, and for mighty good reasons, and the Western Socialists who have been warm admirers of Debs and Hagerty. And note, finally, how this disgusting schemer, through his garbled "volcanic rumblings" and malicious perversions of facts in his blackmail sheet, has incited and encouraged and magnified differences that developed in the

Socialist movement throughout the country. Would a man who is a Socialist resort to such contemptible tricks year in year out? If he is a Socialist, why does he attempt to comfort the capitalistic enemy by continually making war not only upon the honest views, but upon the individual character, of every Socialist, man or woman, who dares to disagree with him? If he is a Socialist and really despises the pure and simple policy of Gompers, why does he everlastingly villify and slander the men in the trade union movement who are attempting to the best of their ability to supplant the old policies with new ones? If he is a Socialist, why does he hearten and aid every crook and grafter that sneaks into the labor movement by furnishing mud balls and downright falsehoods to be thrown at the Socialists who are attempting to keep the unions clean and respectable? I repeat that the day that this cold-blooded schemer has longed for has arrived. Already in a score of places dissension has developed in the Socialist party, and we find our own members parroting the phrases coined by De Leon a dozen years ago, writing articles for his disreputable organ, and attempting to revive his malevolent and repudiated policies. Is our splendid party and dues-paying organization to be wrecked again to satisfy the inordinate cravings of a fool or knave to rule or ruin? It is for the readers of the REVIEW and the Socialists of the country to say whether the Socialist party is to be destroyed by another industrial organization experiment. If the rest of the members can stand it, I will have to, but I protest against accepting the interpretations of the principles of socialism and the policies to be pursued in spreading the propaganda from a professional trouble-breeder. The 400,000 votes of the Socialist party were largely recruited from the trade unions, and I know that in every industrial center of the country the Socialist sentiment is spreading as rapidly as we can safely desire among the organized men. It is a matter of education, and the workers who are unacquainted with the principles of Socialism must be reached by those in whom they have confidence, who help fight their battles and stand by them whether they are right or wrong, because they are of the working class. For more than a decade De Leon, the dancing dervish has been howling against the trade unions, sneering at "boring from within" and firing his mud-batteries from without and what has been the result? The trade unions are stronger than they have ever been, while his own once promising movement has become a fake, and jubilantly, like an old man of the sea or a ship-wrecked pirate, he crawls on board of the new craft and continues his old methods. If the fellow can only "capture" something he is in the seventh heaven of bliss for the time being. But come what will the present trade union movement is bound to go forward, changing its character where necessary to fit conditions as they are met, replacing old leaders with new ones naturally enough, and the very struggles in which it engages will serve to enlighten and discipline the membership until they are in readiness to play their part in changing from one system to another. You can sit up and take notice that the Socialists who have borne the brunt of the fight in the trade unions, who have met and still are meeting the attacks from the four directions indicated, and who have been compelled to penetrate the natural crust of ignorance and prejudice among the rank and file during a period when it was decidedly unpopular to advocate the principles of Socialism, will stand true to their economic organizations despite all their alleged faults, and confusion to all the meddling professors and priests, academics or impossibilists, together with the fossilized conservatives, hypocritical plutocrats and their politicians and grafters.

There is little to chronicle of occurrences of general interest in the labor movement this month. During the "dog days," when business is

usually dull, labor affairs also lag and the active workers embrace the opportunity to lay plans for the celebration of Labor Day. This year, as far as I am able to learn, practically every Socialist speaker in the country, was pressed into service to make a Labor Day address at some union celebration—in fact the demands exhausted the supply. And it was a splendid opportunity to spread the propaganda, with the desperate struggle in Chicago still fresh in the minds of the workers and some important events looming up on the industrial horizon. While the teamsters' strike was officially declared off by the unions, the employers are not waxing very enthusiastic about their victory. It was a mighty costly battle for them, while as a matter of fact the unions engaged in the struggle are nearly all intact and their members are back at work, and in a short time the organizations will be as strong as they ever were. It is not likely that the employers will want a second strike very soon. President Shea, who, like the leading spirit in every great industrial struggle, from Debs to Donnelly, has been denounced and villified by the plutocrats, their press and pulpsters and his opponents in the union, triumphed over all his enemies and was vindicated by a re-election at the Philadelphia convention. He has probably learned something about the class war by this time.

On January 1 the printers employed in the book and job offices on the North American continent will inaugurate a strike for the eight-hour day. The employers have an organization called the United Typothetae, which is in close touch with and will have the support of Parry's National Association of Manufacturers, and the combined bosses, judging from present indications will resist the demand of the journeymen, and, if possible, attempt to deliver a knockout blow to the International Typographical Union, which body is generally regarded as one of the most substantial and best equipped of the national organizations. All the followers of Parryism in the country realize that if they can defeat the I. T. U. their open shop campaign will be greatly strengthened, while on the other hand the international unions in other trades understand that if the printers win the moral effect will be of tremendous advantage on organized labor's side. So we are approaching another crisis.

The miners are also looking forward to next spring, when their agreements in both the anthracite and bituminous coal fields expire. Mitchell and all his lieutenants are working like beavers to strengthen their lines in anticipation of a national struggle. It is no longer a secret that the operators in both fields expect to force a reduction of wages upon the men, and reports from many districts state that the magnates are storing immense quantities of coal to supply the market (at fancy prices, of course) during a suspension. While the miners are compelled to suffer their masters will pile up more fortunes. That is one of the beauties of the capitalist system. And the miners are learning that fact, as you will probably see when the Socialist vote is announced from the mining districts.

Generally speaking, there is no extraordinary activity noticeable in organization work at present. Most of the unions are holding their own, some are making steady gains while a few are reported as losing ground.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GAME, by Jack London. Cloth, 182 pp. The Macmillan Co., \$1.50.

WAR OF THE CLASSES, by Jack London, The Macmillan Co., Paper, 278 pp. 25 cents.

"The Game" is superficially the story of a prize fight and it is a good story. Considered only as a description of the fight it would make the fortune of any sporting editor in America. For most readers this with the love story that runs along with it will be all that is seen, but those who know Comrade London as a socialist will see that "The Game" is the story of a bigger fight than ever took place within the squared circle. It is the game of life that is being fought throughout the book, the game in which the struggle for success swallows up the participant, in which skill, brains and training tell for much, but which at last may be decided by a lucky punch. It is intensely realistic, even to the extent of animalism at times.

The illustrations and decorations by Henry Hutt and T. C. Lawrence are striking features of the book. The pen drawings which open the chapters are ghastly strong at times.

Just now Jack London's fame as an author is being pushed close by his notoriety as a socialist. At least that is the way the capitalist critics put it. The trouble with London is that he is not the ordinary kind of a literary socialist. It would be easy to name a half dozen prominent writers of the last decade who have occasionally admitted that they were socialists, but their socialism was generally of such a mild inoffensive sort that it didn't hurt them much with their capitalist friends. London, however, is the genuine, old fashioned, proletarian, class struggle, etc., socialist. His socialism is like everything else about him, virile, combative and genuine to the back bone.

He does not call his work "The Ethical Aspirations Toward the True and Beautiful," but "The War of the Classes." He indulges in no sentimental dreams about the possibility of betterment of the workers, but declares that "May God strike me dead if I do another day's work with my body more than I absolutely have to do." He says this just after he has described how he went down into the "Social Pit" and saw what waited those who fail in the struggle for survival. "The War of the Classes" is a series of essays, most of which would make excellent propaganda pamphlets. The one on "The Scab" and "The Review" (the latter on Ghent's and Brook's recent books) are already familiar to our readers. Others are on "The Class Struggle," "The Tramp," "The Question of the Maximum" (one of the most striking analyses of international competition ever published) and "Wanted a new Law of Development." There are

enough striking illustrations and strong quotations between the covers of this little book to supply a small army of soap box orators with ammunition.

SOIXANTE-QUINZE ANNES DE DOMINATION, Essays by Camille Huysmans, Louis De Brouckere, and Louis Bertrand, Edited by the General Council of the Parti Ouvrier of Belgium, Paper, 327 pp. one franc.

The seventy-fifth anniversary of the bourgeois revolution in Belgium has just been celebrated, and the Socialists who refused to take part in the rejoicings, address the "patriots" as follows: "We refuse to consider the seventy-five years of bourgeois rule as so many years of independence, since so far as the working class is concerned, they have continued, and even aggravated the oppressions of the preceding regimes. The working class remains your enemy, and when you speak of the seventy-five years of peace you seem to forget, the massacres that have stained our streets with the blood of laborers. 1830 was for us no year of deliverance for our country. We are preparing for a true deliverance ourselves. We will celebrate it later when the proletariat shall have taken its just share of our common inheritance." The work is a most valuable historical survey of Belgian history during the last three quarters of a century.

MY LITTLE BOOK OF PRAYER, by Muriel Stroe, 2nd Edition. The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill.

Just why this title should have been chosen is not apparent. It is true that the author's attitude is often one of prayer, but it is quite as often one of direct affirmation. What we have here, is really a collection of aphorisms and emotional utterances, unrelated to one another, except in so far as they are the expressions of a single, more or less constant mood.

One does not look for any distinct philosophy in a book of this character, and one does not find it here. Obviously the writer is an individualist, but individualism such as hers, which seeks for itself a new path, not because the paths trodden by others have been found undesirable, but merely to taste the exhilaration of novelty, such individualism springs rather from temperament than from reasoned conviction.

The theology of the book seems considerably mixed; but so is most theology.

Here and there, we find tiny fragments, of, shall we say prose, poetry or poetic prose?

These show indeed, no great degree of original talent, but they are graceful both in thought and imagery. The following is illustrative:

Better than tiaras—the diadem of freedom.

Better than broad acres—a garland of heartsease.

Better than mines of gold—a mint of dreams.

Better than bars of silver—the silver of a laugh.

Better than strings of pearls—the crystal of a tear.

Better than bands of choiristers—a lute in the soul."

—LILLIAN HILLER UDELL.

SONGS OF SOCIALISM. By Harvey P. Moyer, The Brotherhood Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Mich., Paper, 96 pages, 25 cents.

This book contains seventy-six songs, considerably more than half of them written by the compiler of the book. He is a song writer of no mean ability, and a surprising number of the songs are really good. This is not saying that most of them are good. A nation's songs can not be produced by the yard on a few months' notice, and the literary quality of

the words in this book is decidedly uneven. As for the music, there are a few original melodies on which we can express no opinion. Most of the songs are set to familiar tunes, as they should be. But familiarity has evidently been the only test of selection. Coon songs, gospel hymns, and rag time music are interleaved with national airs and folk-songs. The compiler's aim has obviously been not so much to educate as to please, and to please those who are just on the edges of the socialist movement. Many of the songs are religious, with occasional anthropomorphic touches. The appeal is largely to the sentiment of brotherhood and altruism. The book will doubtless be welcome and useful in the newer locals and especially in territory that is backward in the industrial sense, and where class lines are not closely drawn.

C. H. K.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS.

The fall of 1905 finds our socialist co-operative publishing house in better condition than ever before, with a larger and more varied stock of books than we have yet been able to offer, and with the prospect of a rapid increase in sales. This is due first to the increased interest in socialism everywhere, and second to the fact becoming more and more generally recognized that in our co-operative plan for supplying books at cost through our stockholders a difficult problem has been solved.

We have now a little over 1,100 stockholders, nearly all of whom have invested just ten dollars each, not with the expectation of drawing dividends but of buying books at cost. The sales of books pay running expenses; there is no deficit except on the REVIEW, of which more hereafter. The new stock subscriptions make possible the publication of new books. If you want to see our list of books increase faster, the way to bring it about is to subscribe for stock and find others who will subscribe.

BOOKS BY REV. CHARLES H. VAIL.

Two of the most useful propaganda books ever published in America are these of which we have bought the plates and copyrights within the last month. MODERN SOCIALISM, now in its fifth edition, contains 179 pages and sells for 25 cents in paper, 75 cents in cloth. PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM, now in its fourth edition, contains 237 pages and sells for 35 cents in paper. We shall soon issue a cloth edition to retail at \$1.00. These books by Comrade Vail are by all odds the most important American works on socialism which we have until now been unable to supply to our stockholders at the same discounts as our regular publications. They can be sold in every socialist local in the United States, and will not only make new converts but help make clear thinkers out of those who already call themselves socialists.

SOCIALIST SONGS, DIALOGUES AND RECITATIONS.

This new collection, edited by Comrade Josephine R. Cole of San Jose, California, supplies a demand that has been constant during several years,

for a book to be used in arranging for socialist entertainments. The selections here offered have the great merit of being adapted to the capacity of children and amateurs. At the same time they are well suited to interest casual listeners in the study of socialism. Paper, 25 cents.

FORCES THAT MAKE FOR SOCIALISM IN AMERICA.

This is a lecture delivered at Cooper Union, New York City, by Comrade John Spargo. He has given the copyright to our co-operative publishing house in order to secure the widest possible circulation for the pamphlet. The subjects treated are: Socialism an International Movement, Growth of the Socialist Vote, the Organized Socialist Movement, Blind Economic Forces, the Trust Problem, the Poverty Problem, Babies and Poodles, Capitalist Domination of the Old Political Parties, the War of the Classes, Growth of the Social Conscience, the Responsibility of Increasing Power. We are sure our readers will welcome this strongly-written pamphlet and that it will make socialists wherever it is circulated. Price 10 cents; to our stockholders 5 cents by mail, 4 cents by express at purchaser's expense.

THOUGHTS OF A FOOL.

This book of satirical essays by "Evelyn Gladys" has puzzled the reviewers of England and America. It is full of keen and clever satire on capitalism and capitalistic ethics. The original publishers, E. P. Rosenthal & Co., printed several thousand copies in sumptuous style, intending to sell them through the usual capitalist channels at \$1.50 a copy. They found that the book tells too much truth to sell in that way. It appeals to working people and revolutionists,—to the very ones who buy their books through our co-operative publishing house. We have now arranged to handle the book as one of our own publications at a dollar a copy, with regular discounts to stockholders. It is the best printed book for the money that we have ever been able to offer.

LIBRARY OF SCIENCE AND THE WORKERS.

The printers delayed us beyond expectation on "Germs of Mind in Planets," but copies are now ready and all advance orders have been filled. Our printers are now at work on "The End of the World" and "Science and Revolution," and we expect to have both of these ready on October 5. Mrs. Simons has nearly completed her translation of "The Triumph of Life," and copies of this should be ready early in November. A. M. Simons is translating "Life and Death," by Dr. E. Teichmann, which will be published in December. We shall soon have a definite announcement to make regarding the works of Josef Dietzgen, including "The Nature of Human Brain Work" and "The Positive Outcome of Philosophy," references to which have appeared in the series of articles by Comrade Unter-mann. We expect to issue one volume of Dietzgen's works before the

end of 1905 and another in 1906. The volumes of the Library of Science for the Workers already issued or in press are as follows:

1. **THE EVOLUTION OF MAN.** By Wilhelm Boelsche. Translated by Ernest Untermann. Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents. Fourth thousand now ready.

Professor Boelsche of Berlin is recognized as the leading popularizer of the evolution theory in Germany. In this book he has chosen the form of a simple narrative, which makes his argument easy for even untrained readers to follow. He traces the history of man backward by aid of the bronze and stone tools and the fossils that show man's life-history on the earth to extend back a million years—a period far longer than was claimed by the earlier evolutionists. Starting then with the caveman of the tertiary period, he traces the ancestry of man backward step by step through ever simpler and simpler forms of life, until he reaches the animal consisting of a single cell. He shows then how this cell itself might have been developed from matter that we call "inorganic" by the action of the same forces that we see working in the universe to-day. The book is illustrated with many engravings showing the different forms of life through which man developed.

"The Evolution of Man" has met with an instant popularity far beyond what the publishers had counted upon. It contains just the information the people are looking for, and it sells at sight wherever it is introduced.

2. **GERMS OF MIND IN PLANTS.** By R. H. Francé. Translated by A. M. Simons. Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents. First edition ready Sept. 1.

This is a delightful and fascinating book. The idea worked out in it is that plants are living beings which receive impressions from the outside world, and act on those impressions for their own advantage, just as people do. This is not a mere fancy: the author brings a wealth of interesting facts to prove that it is true. He shows that the main reason why the voluntary motions of plants have not been generally observed is that in most cases they are exceedingly slow compared with the motions of animals. There are, however, many interesting exceptions to this rule, and he describes a few of these in full detail.

Some of the most important contributions of recent years toward the rounding out of the evolution theory have been in the field of botany, and this little book, now for the first time put within the reach of English readers, is a most charming introduction to this field.

3. **THE END OF THE WORLD.** By Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer. Translated by Margaret Wagner. Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents. First edition ready Oct. 5.

The central thought of this book is that the earth itself, solid and permanent as it appears to us, is subject to the same forces, moving in cycles of evolution, dissolution and new evolution, which operate on everything great and small throughout the universe. The matter of which the

earth is composed is indestructible, but it existed in different forms before the earth was, and it will exist in different forms when the earth has ceased to be. Moreover, time was when the earth had reached almost its present form and yet when the existence of human life on it would have been impossible, and a time is coming when forces now at work will put an end to the cycle of human life on this planet.

It is with these destructive forces that "The End of the World" deals. The book is not fanciful and speculative, but purely scientific, yet it is written in the same delightfully simple style as the other numbers of the Library of Science for the Workers. A companion volume by the same author, entitled "The Making of the World," will appear some time in 1906.

4. **SCIENCE AND REVOLUTION.** By Ernest Untermann. Cloth, 59 cents. First edition ready Oct. 5.

This is an original work by the translator of "The Evolution of Man." Mr. Untermann is a graduate of the University of Berlin, an accomplished linguist, and a special student in biology as well as in social science. He is an American citizen, and within the last few years has done much important writing in American periodicals. The present volume is based on a series of articles which appeared in a prominent review, but their form has been popularized so as to offer few difficulties to the student who wishes to investigate the important subject of the relation of modern science to the working-class movement. The scope of the book is well indicated by the following:

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. Proletarian Science.
 2. The Starting Point.
 3. The Awakening Philosophy.
 4. A Step Forward in Greece.
 5. A Step Backward in Rome.
 6. In the Slough of Ecclesiastic Feudalism.
 7. The Struggle for More Light.
 8. The Resurrection of Natural Philosophy in England.
 9. Natural Philosophy in France.
 10. A Revision of Idealism in Germany.
 11. In the Melting Pot of the French Revolution.
 12. The Wedding of Science and Natural Philosophy.
 13. The Outcome of Classic Philosophy in Germany.
 14. Science and the Working Class.
 15. The Offspring of Science and Natural Philosophy.
 16. A Waif and Its Adoption.
 17. Materialist Monism, the Science and Religion of the Proletariat.
5. **THE TRIUMPH OF LIFE.** By Wilhelm Boelsche. Translated by May Wood Simons. Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents. Ready Nov. 10.

This latest work by the author of "The Evolution of Man" will be found even more fascinating than the earlier volume. It is based on a

series of popular lectures delivered by the author to large audiences in Berlin. In the preface he says:

"We accompany life in its conquest of the planet earth. Out of the boundless space, this earth first appears to us as a star. We rush to this star upon a meteorite. While this strange world-visitor glows and puffs out in the earth's atmosphere, the ocean suddenly sparkles beneath us. This glowing of the water is the work of living creatures, and thus we first enter upon the kingdom of life. We dive down into the cold abyss of the deep sea with its light-giving fishes. Through the primeval water-forest of sea-weed we rise once more to the wondrously colored coral strand. In the stone of this coral island, built of the remnants of life, we find a passage back into the interior of the earth, into the dark caves where the bones of the shapeless saurians of the primitive world lie buried in the rock. From these caves we climb to the glaciers of the ice age, to the mammoths and pre-historic men. The volcanoes of the mysterious south polar land send forth their smoke. In the fern forests of New Zealand we walk once more in the carboniferous age. Now we follow the luxuriant life of the primitive forest of Brazil; we see the blooming palms of India, the wonderful giant trees of Mariposa, the grotesque cactus forms of Mexico; until life fights its last battle for us in the desert and on the eternal snow of the lofty mountain. But out of these wastes comes man, who reads the stars and learns the laws of life. So the triumph of life culminates in the triumph of man, who spreads the rule of his mind over the earth from the equator to the poles.

Any of these books will be mailed on receipt of price, or the five volumes will be mailed to one address for two dollars. Advance orders will help us to bring out additional volumes in the series. These will be announced later.

THE FINANCES OF THE PUBLISHING HOUSE.

It will be seen from the foregoing announcements that the co-operative publishing house is more active than ever before. It is expending more money than ever before in the publication of new books, and the first sales of these books are rapid enough to go far toward paying the cost of publication. There is no deficit on the book business; on the contrary there is a surplus. But all the surplus and more is urgently needed. The paid-up capital of the company is \$12,440, but the total amount invested in books, plates, advertising and the cost of establishing the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* up to the end of July, 1905, was \$29,255.68. Part of the difference has been made up by contributions, and most of the outstanding debt is to stockholders who are satisfied with four per cent. interest and will allow the company to keep the money until it can be repaid conveniently. There is, however, one note of \$400 to a bank drawing seven per cent. which should be paid, and one stockholder has lent us \$1,500 at six per cent. which he needs to withdraw very soon.

These two debts should be gotten out of the way within the next two

or three months. If each stockholder would do a little the matter could easily be closed up, but the trouble is that only a few have done anything. Charles H. Kerr has made an offer, good until the end of 1905, that he will contribute out of what the company owes him as much as all others combined to help clear off the debt once for all. Here is what has been done up to the end of August:

Previously acknowledged	\$733.92
Dr. P. E. Gold, Texas.....	.50
Henry Fliniaux, Nebraska.....	2.00
Lawrence Christiansen, Illinois.....	2.50
B. F. Burkhart, California.....	10.00
William Russell, Cuba.....	.50
Howard Keehn, Pennsylvania.....	1.00
H. T. Smith, Illinois.....	3.00
"D," Florida	4.40
Dr. H. M. Wilson, Pennsylvania	4.00
Edgar N. Phillips, Illinois.....	5.00
Thomas Hitchings, California.....	1.00
A. F. Simmonds, New York.....	1.00
Margaret V. Longley, California.....	5.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	39.90
Total.....	<u>\$773.82</u>

Look back through the last two numbers of the REVIEW and see whether your name is in this list. If it is not, consider whether it would be worth anything to you to know that this publishing house was established on a basis where an accident to one individual would not cripple its work.

Two thousand dollars will accomplish this. Are there not a hundred who will give \$5.00 a month each for four months?

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

OCTOBER, 1905

NO. 4

Recent Tendencies in German Social Democracy.

THE convention of the social democratic party of Germany, which has just been held in Jena, was undoubtedly the most important of all the many important ones held by that great wing of the International socialist movement. The questions to be decided, the character of the discussion, both before and during the convention all indicate that the long years of growth in the German socialist party have reached a climax and that the next few years are going to see history making events in the realm of the Kaiser.

No one will accuse Comrade Kautsky of being an alarmist, yet he uses the following words in the columns of that staid and scientific publication, *Die Neue Zeit* to describe the convention and the conditions amid which it met.

"Never, since the birth of our party, has one of its conventions met during such violently revolutionary times as exists to-day. Even the events of 1870-71 pale compared with those of the Russian revolution. At that time the empire fell at the first blow, but only to give way to a republic that was little more than empire without the emperor. The governmental institutions, bureaucracy, and army, nothing was touched. Even the rising of the Paris commune, glorious as it was, was but the revolt of a single city for a few weeks.

"In Russia, on the contrary, we have a revolution that is shattering the foundation of an entire nation, and that even now has completely disorganized the governmental institutions, bureaucracy and army. A revolution in which the proletariat, not

of one single city, but of every great city of the nation have fought, not for weeks, but for months, and sometimes almost for an entire year. A revolution that from the beginning has found the strongest motive force in the industrial proletariat.

"But it is not alone in its extent and significance, but still more in the consequences that it draws after it that the present Russian revolution is distinguished from that of France in 1870-71. The Russian revolt, in spite of its occasionally strong proletarian character, constitutes the *conclusion of the era of bourgeois revolutions in Europe*. It also, in spite of the bourgeois character, which it still bears, constitutes the *beginning of the era of proletarian revolutions* upon which we are just entering. The events of 1870-71 broke the lethargy of all Europe, and destroyed the equilibrium of its relations. It opened for Europe, with the single temporary exception of Russia and Turkey, a period of peace and free economic development.

"The events of 1905, on the contrary, throw all relations, however fixed they may have been in the past, into a state of instability; they conceal within themselves war, famine, violent overthrow of the present legal order of landlords and usurers, violent resistance of the proletariat, revolutionary conditions of all kinds.

"How suddenly such situations can arise in a country where but yesterday all the world considered them impossible is shown by Hungary.

"It is impossible for us to tell at the present moment what form this struggle will take or what tasks for us will come out of this witches' kettle. But one thing is certain, and that is that we can depend upon almost anything sooner than the permanence of the present situation. No politician is so sure of early shipwreck as the one who depends upon the permanence of existing institutions.

"Every moment of today is pregnant with surprises; it is a time to watch with open eyes, to examine every change on the political horizon, to keep in readiness for the most strenuous exertions, for the political barometer indicates storms ahead."

The report of the party management which is prepared every year before the convention shows an increased strength at every point, notwithstanding the somewhat discouraging result of the by-elections for the Reichstag. The great three million vote has brought with it the necessity for a great extension of organization and education and this work has been actively taken up and pushed throughout the entire membership. The report states that: "In order to cultivate the existing talent many cities have already formed institutions for instruction during the last year, for example a school for agitators was founded in Düsseldorf."

It is difficult to give exact figures of party membership, owing to the method of organization, but all localities report large

increases. In the district around Berlin, for instance, the membership has increased from 37,905 on January 1, 1904, to 47,420 one year later. Great demonstrations have been carried on against the attempt to restrict the suffrage and in favor of peace. Some of these, having already been reported in these columns, need not receive further attention.

The party press reports everywhere increased circulation, and several papers, hitherto constituting a burden upon the party, have become self-supporting. The *Vorwärts* shows a total profit of over \$20,000 during the last year. *Der Wahre Jacob* brought in nearly \$5,000, while *Die Neue Zeit* showed a deficit of over \$1,000, indicating that even this long established and foremost scientific socialist publication of the world is still run at a loss. The total income of the party amounts to over \$180,000 and the number of agitation leaflets and books distributed runs high into the millions.

Meanwhile, however, the party is engaged in internal discussions of more fundamental importance than any that have occupied its attention since the days of the laws of exception. The whole form of party organization is being changed toward a greater centralization. A more revolutionary attitude is permeating its ranks and its membership at every point. It is evidently drawing together for the great battle that all predict must take place in the near future.

The discussions have taken on various forms. One of these is an attack upon the editorial management of the *Vorwärts*. The attack has been conducted largely by the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* and the *Neue Zeit*. The *Vorwärts* has for a long time taken a sort of ostrich attitude with regard to party differences, burying its head in the sand and insisting that it could see no quarrels. It has, for example, constantly denied that there were any divisions between the revisionists and the Marxists. In the meantime, however, it had been gradually drifting away from Marxism. This was seen in its attitude toward the general strike, toward the Russian situation, as was pointed out in an article of Comrade Kautsky's published in an earlier number of the REVIEW, and in its general refusal to participate in party discussions. The result which might have been expected has now occurred. This long smothered discussion has broken out with much greater intensity than it could have possessed had it been conducted openly from the beginning and the *Vorwärts*, so far from being able to maintain its impartial attitude, is now the very center of the turmoil. Kautsky's final article on the matter sums up the whole situation in so broadly a fundamental way as to be applicable to the situation nearly everywhere and especially in this country. From this we take the following quotation:

"SENTIMENTAL AND SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM."

"The *Vorwärts* of today is not the same that it was in the years immediately following the socialist laws of exception. At that time the economic attitude dominated its work. Its policies were formulated by people who were familiar with political economy and economic history and possessed the keenest interest and the fullest understanding of the relations between economics and politics. To grasp this relation and set it forth and thereby explain to their readers modern social and political life appeared to it as its principle purpose. Its attitude was predominantly scientific since social democracy, and indeed modern politics as a whole, is essentially dominated by economic historical thought.

"Today the ethical-esthetic attitude predominates in *Vorwärts*. It is concerned much less with the comprehension of things than with judgments of them. It seeks first of all to produce strong moral and esthetical effects in order to arouse the disgust of its readers against the immorality and hideousness of the existing order. Just as the former attitude of mind may be called scientific socialism, so the latter may be designated as sentimental socialism; not in the sense that its representatives have any less scientific culture or represent less scientific interests, but that the fundamental thing for them in politics is not scientific insight but the attainment of moral and asthetic feelings and sensations.

* * * * *

"Naturally I have no intention of entering upon a philosophical disertation concerning the antagonism between the economic and the ethical-esthetic attitude in the theory of socialism. I have still less reason for doing this because of the fact that the first has found a very accurate expression in the Marxian theory, and that the other still awaits the production of a theoretician.

We are here concerned alone with the effect of the two methods of thought upon our political tactics. There it is easily possible that they may become antagonistic, and this wholly apart for the desire of any individual.

"Naturally I would by no means claim that ethics and esthetics have no part in the struggle of social democracy. In political economy to be sure ethics has no part; neither in the scientific socialism founded upon it. These are concerned with the investigation of social relations. If these end in the formation of conclusions concerning the future, they are as little influenced by ethical demands as are the practical consequences to which modern hygiene leads. But scientific socialism forms only one side of social democracy. The latter is a union of theory and practice, of science and battle, and just as little as ethics or even esthetics enter into scientific investigation, nevertheless they are

of great importance in the class struggle of the proletariat. No class in the midst of a class struggle can wholly dispense with the ethical forces—the sacrifice and enthusiasm of its adherents for its goal. Least of all can a class like the proletariat do this, which has to meet the coercive power of the state and economic superiority, with nothing but the united solidarity of the masses, which becomes the more powerful with the strengthening of its ethical sensations.

“The esthetic element also can play a great part in the politics of the class struggle. Politics and art, especially poetic art, have many points of contact; both seek to elevate and better mankind in the highest degree, both seek to touch and exhaust the greatest depths of the human soul.

“Far from the song of politics being necessary a disgusting song politics and arts can in many ways be of mutual assistance. The politician can give valuable material to the artist and art can mightily strengthen the powers of the politician.

“So it would appear as if there must be complete harmony between these two methods of thought in political practice, but as a matter of fact both cannot simultaneously dominate. Where the economic scientific attitude preponderates and determines the tactics and directions of the economic factor, the two must come in conflict. The *Vorwärts* illustrates this in a most striking manner.

“In its very valuation of the significance of daily events the antagonism between the scientific and the sentimental socialist is evident. What is in the highest degree interesting to the one appears to the other as unimportant and indeed insignificant. While those things that arouse the strongest momentary activity of the emotions is not always that which influences state and society most fundamentally.

“The events and questions that have the strongest and most enduring effect on the evolution of the whole are often of an insignificant appearance, difficult to recognize and generally only apparent after investigation, and having very little relation to ethical events. The description of a usurer who mercilessly crushes his victims has a much different effect in arousing emotions than a theory of capital. But the effective ethical phenomena and questions are just these superficial phases of things.

“So it is that the journalist who is dominated by the ethical point of view is inclined to consider the superficial sensational phenomena of the moment, as of the greatest political importance, and to look upon all further investigation as a work having little significance with politics. The investigation of the significance and outlook for the general strike, for example, appears to him as wholly unnecessary so long as this is not at our very doors.

A case of judicial abuse of authority on the other hand becomes an event to which he cannot devote enough attention.

"But it is not alone that the over valuation of ethical interests leads the political party journalist to superficiality and sensation mongering, to an undervaluation of investigation into the reasons for agitation—all of which does not prevent him from *theoretically* claiming the greatest admiration for investigation and declaring that all "science" and "explanation" are of the greatest value. This deeper investigation in practice often has a horror for him.

"There is nothing easier than to unite mankind 'ethically,' and to arouse their moral indignation against disgusting phenomena. These superficial phenomena are generally very simple and it is ordinarily not difficult to come to a judgment as to whether they are good or bad. Nothing, for example, is easier than to arouse the public opinion of the whole civilized world against the instigators of the Jewish massacre of Kishineff. So it was that the *Vorwärts* began to dream that we could some time make such an impression upon public opinion that only a 'small present' of the population would be opposed to us, and this small present would be 'condemned to helplessness' through their isolation.

"If we are not satisfied with condemnation but seek to understand and observe these revolting cruel phenomena of our society, not by themselves alone, but in their relations: if we seek to investigate their reasons and to understand how far and in what way we are to meet them, then we strike upon highly conflicting questions, the answers to which are of the most divergent character according to the way in which they are presented and the class position of those who are called upon to act.

"Turn, for example, once more to so apparently a simple question as to the Jewish massacre of Kishineff. Nothing is easier than to become indignant over this. On the other hand great differences appear as quick as we ask from whence comes this phenomena, how shall they be removed? In what relation do they stand to the political and social conditions of all Russia, indeed, of all the world? Shall we strive for the assimilation of the Jews, their absorption into the surrounding population, or for their unrestricted organization as an independent nation? If we favor the latter shall we seek their national independence within Russia, or the creation of a new state for them? All these questions are related to each other and to that of the Russian absolutism. Where are the roots of its power and how shall they be undermined? Concerning these the most manifold differences appear.

"If the ethical method leads to the easiest possible union of diverse elements it is undoubtedly true that the economic materialist leads with equal ease to strife and to division even of

those elements that belong together. It is evident that the first method finds its activity injured and restricted by the second, since the latter rejects the former, sows dissension where that unites and consequently that the followers of the ethical method wish to get rid of all "internal questions" which appear to them to serve only to destroy the uniform moral uprising that they have aroused or think they have aroused.

"These reproaches are, to be sure, baseless. It is not the unity of moral indignation or of 'public opinion' that moves the world and condemns our opponents to helplessness, but the unity of *action*. This will never be created, simply by moral indignation. It is only necessary to return once more to our illustration. If there was ever complete unity of the public opinion of the whole civilized world it was in opposition to the massacre of Kishineff. Was the Russian absolutism thereby 'condemned to helplessness?' Not a hair of it was disturbed, not an iota of its power taken away, not a single Russian loan among European financial Jews hindered. But wherever 'public opinion' or moral indignation is strong enough to compel action it is never so uniform as is the indignation. The latter only demands that something shall *not* be done, that something be condemned, but says nothing whatever about what shall take its place, or how it shall be brought about, and views about these things will differ, and the action will be more divergent, just in proportion as the battle of theoretical discussion has not previously taken place in order that the attitude may be made clear.

"The play of ethical sentimental socialism is much more extensive in the romantic lands, even in the daily press, and the ethical literary politics plays a much greater role than with us. But it is just in these lands that we find the greatest disintegration in organization and action. The unity of organization and action which has so strikingly characterized the German Social Democracy is in no slight degree a result of the fact that from the very beginning it has cherished that 'fundamental error,' according to *Vorwärts*, of discussing its internal questions at its congresses and in the party press with the most intense interest. So for example, in the case of general strike, any united action of party and unions was only possible after the most thoroughgoing discussion concerning all its phases and its tactics. If the party and the unions had been satisfied with the attitude which our central organ advocated, that in case of a *coup d'état* all means, including that of a general strike, are morally justifiable, and that in such a case even all the citizens would be morally obligated to strike, then this moral meaningless side of the question would alone have been kept in mind and the study of the material side would have been wholly rejected; then indeed many a 'party quarrel' would have been

avoided, but on the day of action the uniform moral uprising would have been transformed into a headless chaos with the application of *all* means including the most contradictory and purposeless.

"The distinction of the ethical and sentimental attitude in party journalism leads to still other phenomena. I have already remarked that it is very easy to arouse indignation concerning single horrible phenomena of the present society. Indeed nearly all mankind are generally aroused in much the same manner by every horror from which they do not derive any advantage. Who is there that is not aroused by a misuse of women and children, or the treatment of miners by the coal barons? The *Vorwärts* is right when it avows that the whole population can be aroused to indignation by the publication of such facts 'with the exception of a small percent of those who through their favorable position in the present society are from the nature of things the enemies of the labor movement.' This does not prove, however, that with the exception of this 'small percent' all classes of the people in our present division of society can be won for the battle of socialism, but rather that this indignation is no especial sign of a socialist; but that in such a movement the latter is only distinguished from the remainder of the population by the greater intensity of his sensations. He is distinguished, however, from the adherents of all other parties, as well as from the mass of indifferent, by his economic insight into the relation of these horrors to the total process of present society: it is his distinctive characteristic that it is only by this that he can be convinced.

"This is naturally a point of view shared by every party member and which makes him a party member. But its expression becomes less and less evident the more the ethical side of politics is brought to the front. The ethical side is in no way peculiar to us, but is shared with countless bourgeois elements for example with social reformers as well as the bourgeois radicals, and indeed by avowed reactionaries, pious Christians and the like.

"Never was it more essential than just at present to place the theoretical socialist education in the foreground of the party press, and not simply to sow ethical indignation against Byzantinism, popular brutalization and exploitation, but to show the justice and necessity of Socialism in the light of daily events, with their fundamental economic motive forces. Ever larger grows the influx of untrained elements in the party, and the unions; ever more numerous the practical tasks, and the shorter the time accessible to each individual for study. Relative to the number of party members and the unions our book and pamphlet literature de-

creases in importance and is fairly swamped by the daily papers. To these latter falls more and more the task of spreading the theoretical insight and socialist knowledge, and this, not simply by means of scientific supplements, that are never noticed by the majority of readers, but in the very dealing with the questions of the day, politics, legal events and the economic struggle. Here it is necessary to turn the mind of the reader from the superficial sensations, on which the bourgeois press so richly feeds him, and direct his attention to the deeper social relations and their lines of evolution."

It is impossible to give any full reports of the work of the Congress, as only the Associated Press dispatches are available. These report that the three main topics of the convention were the question of the celebration of the first of May, the reorganization of the party, and the general strike, or as it is called in Germany to distinguish it from the anarchistic use of the same words the "political mass strike."

The discussion of this question reflected the strained relations that are now existing in Germany. The kingdom of Saxony and several of the Hanse cities, including Hamburg, have taken steps to further restrict popular suffrage. In the face of this situation the party decided that if anything was actually done towards further restricting the right to vote that the mass strike would be declared.

This attitude of the party with regard to the general strike, which has hitherto been rather disdained by the German socialists, is extremely significant, and is suggestive of what we may soon expect to see in the United States. The recent actions in Colorado and other places indicate a willingness of the capitalist class of America to resort to violent and illegal methods the moment the class war becomes particularly sharp. It behooves the Socialist Party to prepare itself to meet these attacks. This is one of the more important reasons why the Industrial Workers of the World is a necessity at this time on the industrial field to render possible effective co-operation of all portions of the proletarian army.

A. M. SIMONS.

The Gist of Marxism.

CARL MARX established the science of political life. It is the science of collective action, the law of social movements, of social life considered as a "process." We commonly speak of socialism in distinction from individualism, but this is misleading and should be avoided. When we come to look closely we find that there is no such thing as individualism. Our present society is not individualistic. It is not established to protect the rights of the individual. To concede this is to give our whole case away.

No society could possibly be more ruthless of the rights of the individual than our present society. These count for nothing and are sacrificed by thousands without the slightest compunction, as if the sacrifice were a religious duty. In fact, one of the most striking phenomena of present times is the absolute indifference and callousness amounting to fatalism of the so-called public for the rights and wrongs of individuals. There is something higher in present society than the individual. In other words, our present society is collective. It is managed by and for a collectivity. This collectivity is a property class called the capitalist class. Fealty to this collectivity is to-day the essence of religion, patriotism, civic duty and all ethics. Disloyalty to this collectivity is called sedition, treason, immorality, pessimism, etc.

Such is the discovery that Marx made, and it does not seem to be very much of a discovery until you come to measure its importance by the fury it arouses when an attempt is made to draw the logical conclusions from it. Then hell breaks loose; the existence of classes is vociferously denied and the claim is brazenly put forth that present society stands for the individual, but not for any class.

Marx went a step deeper and explained how classes are formed out of industrial conditions. But we are not now concerned about the origin and disappearance of classes. We are merely discussing the next-to-hand fact that classes do exist and that social life, even under class rule, is collective and not individualistic.

Every society must have a collectivity as its essential and vital part. Its life is collective. This collectivity may embrace only a part or it may embrace the whole of the society, as it will under socialism. The issue therefore is not socialism versus individualism, both being forms of collective life. Marx's discovery has called into existence a number of new words, such as classism, classal, class-interests, class-consciousness, etc.

In civil life classes have no formal existence in law. Hence it is easy in argument to claim that there are no classes in this country and to quote the constitution and statutes to prove it. But as the statutes are merely paper, printed and bound, this only means that we have no classes *on paper*. So much the more do we have them in fact. But in political life classes exist on paper as well as in fact. They are called parties and are recognized in the law. Since the existence of political parties cannot be denied (as are classes), the only thing the hypocrites can do is to deprecate them as a necessary evil. But with Marx parties are not a necessary evil. They are at present a necessary good; and the spirit of partisanship, the sacrifice of individual interests for party welfare is the noblest sacrifice, the highest expression of ethics, we have yet reached and ranks equally with the sacrifice of the soldier who lays his life and honor on the altar of his (supposed) country. But the glory of partisanship is at the same time its own condemnation. So long as classes exist no other form of ethics is possible except partisanship or class fealty. All other forms are excluded. We throw out this hint for the benefit of the charity workers, who stand on a moral plane far below the stalwart partisan.

But there is a form of ethics yet higher than partisanship. That is, under socialism, when all classes and parties are merged into the totality, the sacrifice of individual interests will then be for the benefit of the totality and not simply for a collectivity consisting of one class or one party only. Not only that, but the individual sacrifice will lose its altruistic character and become a matter of self-interest. Extremes will meet. Collectivism and individualism will be merged into each other, as they never can be under classism.

This is the gist of Marxism for us. But besides being a political philosopher Marx was also a materialist and an economist. Although we do not agree with him in these two latter capacities, we have no desire to stir up a controversy on these subjects. We only hope that the attention devoted to these by socialist writers will not cause the political doctrine of Marx to become obscured, but that it will retain its place at the very head and front of the Marxian edifice.

MARCUS HITCH.

Socialism and Philosophy.

THE following pages are in part a reply to a short article by Mr. Charles H. Chase, entitled "Materialism and its Relations to Propagandism of Socialism," which appeared in this magazine as long ago as November, 1903, in part an attempt towards a rough sketch of the general relations of socialist theory and philosophy,—a subject which has of recent years received but scant attention in American and English socialist journals.

Mr. Chase's main contention was, that idealism and not materialism should be accepted as the philosophical basis of socialism (and evolution); and he objected to materialism because of its defectiveness as a philosophic theory and its determinism. Unfortunately, in stating his objections to materialism, Mr. Chase reduced his argument to chaos by confounding determinism with predestinarianism, and by using the word fortuitous in such a way as to awaken the impression that, according to the materialistic hypothesis, certain portions of the universe are not subject to what we call natural law. So far as the dogmatic philosophical materialists are concerned, I am in substantial agreement with Mr. Chase, who calls their explanations of the ultimate nature of phenomena irrational assumptions; on the other hand, I am equally convinced that the assumptions of dogmatic idealists are no less irrational. And although few of us would care to go as far as John Licke, and say that it is best to "sit down in quiet ignorance of those things which upon examination are found to be beyond the reach of our capacities,"—for there is no telling what development of our capacities the future may bring,—or assert with the agnostic that these same things are not only unknown but unknowable, we are at any rate certain that until more knowledge is at our disposal than at the present time, all explanations of the totality of things must of necessity be irrational and imperfect.

Philosophy, as generally understood to-day, may be characterized as the science, or study, which seeks to form a synthesis of, and at the same time to supplement and criticise, the results which are being obtained in the various departments of human knowledge. It is the office of the special sciences to collect and weigh facts and to co-ordinate or systematize our knowledge of particular classes of phenomena. It is the duty of philosophy to investigate critically and to organize into a whole the results which have been obtained in the special sciences. It generally

happens that the results obtained in any one field of research cannot be thoroughly understood except in relation to the others; and it is in its criticising, co-ordinating function, which is apt to lead to the development of new and suggestive hypotheses, that the chief value of philosophy lies. It is clear that the special sciences must react upon philosophy and necessitate a constant shifting of its data and principles, and philosophy in turn, by virtue of its criticism and systematization, must react upon and, to a certain degree, modify the results achieved by the special sciences. From this it follows in theory,—and here theory is for once wholly in harmony with practice,—first, that there can be but *one* philosophy in the sense in which the word is used to-day, although there may be many philosophical theories, and, second, that philosophy, like its subject-matter the special branches of knowledge, must undergo continual transformation and development. The folly of attempting to build up a complete system of philosophy in the expectation of arriving at the ultimate truth of things, or of searching for *a-priori* principles from which a satisfactory explanation of the entire universe may be obtained, is self-evident. This, it is true, is denied by metaphysicians; and in the article by Mr. Chase we find the statement that there can be no philosophy without a metaphysical basis, that the philosophy which ignores metaphysics has no foundation,—no commanding power to give it credence.

Now, in view of the fact that during the last two or three centuries the chief endeavor of the more independent and advanced thinkers of the world has been to eliminate the transcendental element from philosophical, no less than from scientific research in general, it may well be asked, how is it that at this late day it can be considered desirable or necessary that philosophy should have a metaphysical foundation?* A partial answer to this query is given in the last few words of the preceding paragraph; namely, that some philosophers desire a commanding power to give their systems credence. In other words, these so-called "systems" are designed for some ulterior purpose, or, at least, to harmonize with some preconceived belief, and are in consequence based on dogmatic *a-priori* conceptions which are neither to be disproved nor demonstrated. For it is evident that the moment a commanding power to give anything credence is desired, someone has an axe to grind, and in the

*It is plain that we must take many things for granted, of which we are as yet unable to offer any adequate explanation; but the fact that we are still unable to offer an adequate explanation is surely no excuse for our putting forth prematurely an obviously inadequate one and calling it absolute truth, as is the practice of metaphysicians. The foundation of philosophy, no less than of science, is the facts of life as presented to us in consciousness, in other words, as perceived by us; and the completeness of philosophy depends upon the completeness of our knowledge of these facts; not upon *a priori* speculations.

case of metaphysical speculation the axe generally consists in theological conceptions of God, immortality, freedom of the will, and the like, or such political and ethical notions as are conformable with one or another established form of society. Berkeley, for example, worked out his celebrated theory of knowledge with the avowed purpose of inquiring into the "Grounds of Scepticism, Atheism, and Irreligion," and of refuting them; and the more recent attempts of various German philosophers of history have been directed rather to the disproof of the theories of socialism, notably historical materialism, than to the sifting of fresh data or the discovery of new and important truths. As John Stuart Mill said in his essay on the *Utility of Religion*, "The whole of the prevalent metaphysics of the present century is one tissue of suborned evidence in favor of religion; often of Deism only, but in any case involving a misapplication of noble impulses and speculative capacities, among the most deplorable of those wretched wastes of human faculties which make us wonder that enough is left to keep mankind progressive, at however slow a pace;*" apart from the nobility of the impulses, which experience has so often given us reason to doubt, John Stuart Mill was right.

On the other hand, there are systems of philosophy with metaphysical tendencies which may be considered as little more than weapons forged for the purpose of combatting those same survivals in the shape of creed and dogma which are still held to be the most valuable of the possessions of the organized churches. The common-sense materialism of natural science, for example, provides us with a complete armament of slings and arrows to be used on the dogmas of orthodox and official theology; and in so far as it is based upon natural law and the facts which have been supplied to us by our actual experience of phenomena, and is kept to its proper use as a working hypothesis, it is entitled to our respect and adherence;—for, indeed, as a working hypothesis it has no equal. As soon, however, as materialism is rounded off into a philosophical "system,"—monistic, pluralistic, or otherwise,—it at once becomes saturated, so to speak, with metaphysical elements (Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe* is a good example), and forfeits all right to be taken seriously as philosophy, although it still retains its potency as a means of waging war on the metaphysics of theology, and in the hands of the militant free-thinkers of to-day is playing a by no means unimportant role in the progress of civilization and enlightenment. Only we must not deceive ourselves into believing it to be worth much more as philosophy than the idealistic

*Three Essays on Religion, third edition, p. 72.

or dualistic systems it would destroy. Moreover, the ethical and social teachings of a Büchner, Haeckel, or Strauss—a kindred soul, yet hardly to be called a materialist,—are, as reflections of the spirit of middle-class capitalism, not only antiquated but wholly to be condemned.*

Another reason why metaphysics still continues to meet with favor in certain quarters, is to be found in the fact, already stated, that philosophy is far from being either complete or immutable. To the solution of some of its problems,—such, for example, as are presented by the theories of knowledge and of the beginning of things,—an apparently insurmountable barrier is presented by the limits of the human intellect itself. Some of its branches, particularly ethics, history and statistics—in fact, all of the social sciences,—are still in their early infancy, and few others can yet be said to have passed their introductory stages. Fresh problems are continually arising, and as each step forward throws light not only upon the subject immediately at hand, but also upon those branches of knowledge which stand nearest to it, the scene is one of constant transformation and development.

To some naive, emotional souls this is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. That philosophy should be capable of transformation and development is no less disturbing to them than that its fundamental conceptions are naturalistic and not mystical. Neither content nor able gradually to work their way onwards on the basis of what has already been achieved by patient research, they are irresistibly impelled to create for themselves a complete cosmology, ontology, epistemology and what not, in the light of which all phenomena shall be accounted for and all problems find a solution. Instead of a transformed and transforming science, they want truth—absolute and impregnable—and inasmuch as many systems of absolute truth have been and still are being offered to the credulous, each chooses for himself the one which appeals most to his temperament, his politics, or his creed—and fossilizes. Such metaphysicians as a rule have no axe to grind other than the subjective ideological one supplied by their own nature; whatever their failings they are sincere, and although as a rule too greatly absorbed by their visions of transcendental perfection to be of much use in this imperfect world, they are harmless.

The farther back in time we go, the greater necessity there

*Strauss, to choose a random example, considered the abolition of capital punishment "a crime against society;" in regard to the labor question, he advises employers to help themselves, very much as they are helping themselves to-day saying—"you have it in your power; if they refuse to work for you at your price, oppose them with the refusal to permit them to work for you at their price; if necessary, import laborers from foreign lands that the refractory ones may see who is able to hold out the longest!" "these besotted fanatical masses" (in allusion to the working class). Comp. *The Old and the New Belief*, sections 83, 86, etc.

was for speculation. Spinoza,—the very last man whom one could suspect of being a metaphysician,—prefaced his thoroughly naturalistic philosophy with a collection of *a-priori* definitions and axioms which from the point of view of consummate art are never likely to find their equal. At his time it was incumbent upon philosophers to build up complete systems. Of what use, thought they, is a philosophy which creeps and grovels before the hackneyed (yet unsolved) problems of concrete being instead of rising at once to the region of the abstract and absolute. And this was largely because there had not been enough systematic research into the common facts of experience to furnish a basis broad and strong enough to build on without constant recourse to *a-priori* assumptions. Just as Karl Marx was forced to be content with the Hegelian theory of evolution as a working hypothesis, Spinoza was forced to speculate. Modern metaphysicians, however, are at the best but pygmies compared to the great metaphysicians *malgré eux* of earlier days, and, what is still worse, have a far smaller excuse to offer for their productions. Neither Hume nor Kant,* Locke nor Fichte, are to be considered metaphysicians if we compare them to a Hegel or a Haeckel:—and few of the idealistic psychologists and philosophers of the present day, such men as Mach, Avenarius and Cohen, not to speak of the evolutionists, positivists and naturalists, have shown any alarming tendency to revert to the aeronautic speculations of by-gone times.

Now, if by the term metaphysical basis Mr. Chase meant a hypothesis or series of hypotheses founded on our knowledge of phenomena as given to us in experience,—hypotheses which are suggestive of new problems and from which we may work up to more comprehensive theories,—there is no particular reason why we should not agree with him, although he should not have replaced the metaphysical materialism which he combats by a form of idealism that is no less metaphysical; but if by a metaphysical basis he meant what we generally understand by the word metaphysical, namely, the pursuit of "absolute truth," of the "absolutely real as it exists for all intelligence" (Ferrier), involving speculations into the ultimate nature of phenomena on the ground of *a-priori* principles and preconceived ideas more or less arbitrarily assumed,—why, then, we cannot agree. Metaphysics as thus understood, and, as a matter of fact, metaphysics

*In regard to Kant's "transcendental" method Robert Adamson says in his *Fichte*, p. 112, note: "The term transcendental probably has, for English ears, an unpleasant ring, and will suggest metaphysical efforts to transcend experience. It must be understood, however, that transcendental method is simply the patient and rigorous analysis of experience itself. For any question or theorem which might pass beyond possible experience, Kant reserved the term transcendent; and the distinction, if not the mode of expressing it, is accepted by all his successors. Neither in Kant nor in Fichte is there anything in the slightest degree resembling what is commonly called metaphysics."

has long been understood in this sense, is much more nearly allied to theology than to philosophy; and however well adapted it may be to the purposes for which, as was indicated in the quotation from John Stuart Mill, it is employed to-day, it is certainly not suitable as a theoretical basis for either socialism or evolution.

It is indeed a matter of practical indifference to the theory of socialism how the statical problem of the universe is solved; we are not concerned with abstract investigations into the ultimate constitution either of matter or of force, but with the *mutual relations* of phenomena considered as such, chiefly, in fact, with the mutual relations of men; in short, our main interest lies in all questions which have a direct bearing on the practical affairs of human society. Such questions of ethical, social, political, economic and biological science and their accompanying theories are in no way dependent upon the assumptions of either idealists* or materialists; they are concerned not with the *statical*, but with the *dynamic* aspect of things; and in proportion as problems of vital interest arise, in proportion as we are called upon to take an active part in the creation of a new order of society, we must concentrate our attention upon those sciences which form the intellectual foundation of such action. Evolution is the branch of philosophy which treats of the dynamic as distinguished from the statistical aspect of phenomena, and it is from the point of view of evolution as applied to society that we must in last instance conduct our researches.

II.

In what relation, then, do the theories of socialism stand to philosophy? We have seen that it is the office of philosophy to investigate critically, systematize and supplement the results obtained in the various departments of scientific inquiry. Socialism is, in last instance, a conscious endeavor on the part of men to reorganize society on a collective basis, and, like all other highly organized activities, it stands in intimate connection with various theories—social, economic, ethical, historical and political—which serve in part as a guide to the practical labors of socialists, in part as a key to the historical significance of the movement. Now, the theories by which the practical activities of socialists are guided and explained are distributed, together with all other scientific theories, among the different branches of knowledge, which in turn are gradually being co-ordinated and

*Even Berkeley, who is popularly supposed to have denied the existence of the real and substantial in nature, Berkeley who started out with subjective and ended up with theological idealism, said, "I do not argue against the existence of any one thing that we can apprehend either by sense or reflexion. That the things I see with my eyes and touch with my hands do exist, really exist, I make not the least question."—*Principles of Human Knowledge*, Par. 39.

welded together by philosophy. The theories of socialism, therefore, stand in the same relation both to philosophy and to the other scientific theories as these to one another. Not all of the special sciences are directly connected with the theories of socialism: those treating more especially of the statical aspect of things, and others, including the majority of the natural sciences, the science of language, etc., are, indeed, a long distance removed from the specific field of socialist thought. Consequently we may expect the theories of socialism to have little if any direct modifying influence either on such sciences or on the philosophical problems which they involve; and it follows that, even apart from the fact that there can be only one philosophy, it is not only wrong to speak of a philosophy as being the peculiar property of socialism,*—philosophy not being the peculiar property of any individual or group of individuals,—but a mistake even to wish to burden ourselves, in so far as we are socialists and not philosophers, with what would be in part a most unprofitable luxury. On the other hand, as has already been indicated, socialism is most closely connected with certain branches of knowledge, which treat more especially of the dynamic aspect of things and are included under the general term of social science (economics, ethics, history, politics, law, demography, etc.) forming a distinct branch of philosophical inquiry. We have seen that the hypothesis which seeks to answer the dynamical problem of the universe is the theory of evolution; and the theory of evolution is in turn based on various fundamental natural laws,† such as causality, the conservation of energy, the continuity of motion, the indestructibility of matter, and the redistribution of matter and motion. These laws are neither materialistic nor idealistic; they are not founded upon the ultimate constitution of things, but upon the observed relations of phenomena. And the most important of them all, the keystone as it were of the entire edifice is the law of causal connection.

The theory of socialism,—that is to say, the theories of so-

*It need hardly be said that, what is sometimes known as the "socialist philosophy," is not philosophy at all in the strict sense of the term, but the general conception of life and of things social, historical, economic, ethical, and otherwise, which is shared to a greater or lesser degree by all socialists. That it is not what we mean now-a-days by philosophy, does not of course detract in the least from its value. Dietzgen's so-called socialist philosophy is a discussion of various philosophical problems from the standpoint of a socialist. The majority of these problems, however,—the theory of knowledge, causality, etc.—have no exclusive bearing on socialism, and have been discussed in much the same manner by philosophers who were not socialists. It is obvious that these can be nothing specifically socialistic in their interpretation. Finally it may be said that, although there is, properly speaking, no "socialist philosophy," there is at any rate, a philosophy of socialism; and this is the study, or science, which seeks to co-ordinate socialism, its theories and manifestations, with the other phenomena of human existence.

†Be it remembered that a natural law is a broad generalization based upon the facts of perception as registered in human experience. With these facts it must stand or fall. It may safely be left to the metaphysician to decide whether or not it is consistent with the facts which lie beyond human experience.

cialism taken as a whole,—is thus in last instance based on the evolutionary hypothesis,* and in special on that branch of evolution which is concerned with the development of human society. That there are many apparent contradictions between the theories of socialism and evolution as interpreted by non-socialist philosophers is largely due to the fact that scarcely anything has yet been accomplished towards the application of the theory of evolution to social problems, and to the subjective limitations under which its chief exponents have hitherto suffered; namely, their imperfect knowledge of economic science, their uncritical individualism, their incorrigible propensity to confuse collectivism with so-called state socialism, their anthropological and biological preconceptions,† and their palpable incompetence to deal with the facts of history. As it is, little more than a beginning has been made, and so far as I know, there has as yet been no serious attempt to work out the relations between the doctrines of socialism, including the materialistic conception of history, and the facts of evolution. The majority of the theorists of socialism are still too greatly under the influence of the Hegelian dialectic, or, as now seems to be the fashion, of Kant, and the evolutionists—whose thoughts generally run to biology rather than to the social sciences—as a rule know nothing of socialism.

We have thus seen that the various elements of socialist theory have to do with dynamic rather than statical problems. Taken together they form a composite theory of human development, which, although far from having been worked out in all its details, is, like all other scientific theories, based on our experience of phenomena, in other words, on the facts of life. Philosophically considered, dynamic theories are as a whole grouped under the general heading of evolution, which is in turn

*Just now there is a wide-spread tendency for non-socialist speakers and writers to employ the terms evolution and revolution as mutually exclusive conceptions,—the one signifying a gradual process of unrolling and the other a sudden catastrophe. It is true that the process of evolution taken as a whole is gradual; it is no less true that it has been accompanied by sudden (local) changes and catastrophes without number, the significance of which can only be understood in their relation to the entire process. A volcanic eruption or the passage of a hurricane are no less a part of evolution than a social revolutionary upheaval. As a rule, the individual who places the terms revolution and evolution in antithesis with one another is merely a modern instance of Sydney Smith's famous Noodle, who was satisfied with things as they are and did not want to be precipitate. The object of revolutionary socialism is to establish society on a collective basis and to abolish the struggle for existence; in other words, to revolutionize society. Whether this process of revolution be swift or slow, violent or peaceful, whether it result to a greater or a lesser degree from the cumulative effects of gradual social changes, including reforms, or from a sudden seizure of the means of production by the entire people, it is no less a revolution than a part of the all-embracing process of evolution.

†That socialism is consistently opposed by many contemporary biologists is largely due to the popular belief that competition in the shape of a struggle for existence is essential to human progress. That the outcome of the industrial competition of to-day is the physical and moral deterioration of all concerned, and that this process of deterioration cannot be checked by such half-way measures as the erection of new hospitals and the enlargement of state prisons is a fact that is only slowly beginning to dawn upon their understandings.

a synthesis and criticism of all sciences which have to do with the dynamic aspect of things. It is the task of evolution to answer but one of the two great questions of philosophy; namely, to describe and to explain so far as is possible the universal process of transformation. It is not with the relation of knowledge to the problem of *being* but with its relation to the problem of *becoming* that we are here concerned. The elements in which we work must be accepted as realities; and all metaphysical questions as to the ultimate constitution of the materials in which evolution deals, or as to how the objective world manages to become a part of consciousness, may be set aside as belonging to another department of philosophical inquiry.

Evolution is the philosophy of the facts of life as presented to us in life. It is neither monism, dualism, nor pluralism: for whatever the attitude of men to the ultimate problems involved in these transcendental conceptions, it cannot alter the mutual relations of phenomena. The theoretical basis of evolution, in fact, the theoretical basis of all philosophy and science, is the law of causal connexion. Causality, when applied to human affairs, is called determinism; and in the following section I shall attempt to answer Mr. Chase's objections to this law.

III.

Although the constant dropping of water may in the course of ages wear away the hardest of stone, it is probable that more than mere drops of ink are required to disintegrate a time-honored fallacy. And when we consider all that has been written on determinism in the past, together with the many works that have appeared on the subject within recent years,* further comment would seem superfluous. Yet one cannot pass by in silence the statement that it is folly—to use Mr. Chase's words—for one who believes in determinism to put forth an effort of will, and much more to act, or that materialism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction *because it is deterministic*. Let us say at once, that determinism is simply the law of causality applied to the actions of human beings, and that it has nothing to do with predestinarianism—a purely religious conception—as has often been pointed out, notably in the first chapter of Buckie, where the subject is treated at some length and a large number of authorities referred to. Nor is determinism fatalism. For although fatalists also set out from causal connexion and are thus fundamentally in agreement with determinists, they either neglect, or deny outright, such well-established facts of consciousness as

*Two very good books are *Das Problem der Willensfreiheit*, by Dr. Leo Muffelmann, Leipzig, 1902; and *Willensfreiheit, Zurechnung, und Verantwortung*, by Dr. Max Offner, Leipzig, 1904. So far as I know there are no recent works in English on the subject of determinism. A fairly good historical account of the problem is to be found in Bain's *Mental and Moral Science*.

conscience and the feeling of responsibility, holding them to be illusions, or, like the fatalists of the East, they turn philosophy into religion by the introduction of anthropomorphic and mystical elements, and thus deprive it of all scientific value.

The chief objections offered to determinism are, that it implies a mechanical conception of things and is apparently not to be reconciled with the fact that we are conscious of freedom. Of these two objections, the former may be set aside as trivial. Because machines, as we know them, as well as the machinery of inorganic nature in general, are presumably not gifted with either human or divine intelligence, it is supposed that the term mechanical when applied to organic life signifies a corresponding lack of intelligence and spontaneity in organisms. This is manifestly absurd, for the word mechanical simply means acting in accordance with natural law and is far from involving a denial of psychological phenomena. Moreover, our calling a thing mechanical does not mean that we understand it any better than if we called it by some other name; for the ultimate problems of force and motion, as encountered in the inorganic world, are apparently no nearer solution or less difficult of comprehension than the ultimate problems of human mind. Finally, the objection to the term mechanical is in nine cases out of ten an objection to natural law itself, and the prejudice against natural law is, as a rule, an outcome either of a preference for metaphysical speculations or a desire to grind a theological axe.

The feeling that we are free is another question. It is so often present in consciousness as to admit no doubt of its reality. An adequate explanation, however, is to be found in the fact that our motives (thoughts or feelings which lead to action) are not determined exclusively by objective forces and phenomena, but also by certain subjective psychological elements. These psychological elements, taken as a whole, are called character, or personality. They are relatively the most constant part of the ego, and in so far as our motives are determined by them, we can be said to act on our own initiative. For in such cases our actions may be determined, and are at the very least influenced, by psychological forces, which through long association have become an integral part of ourselves. On the other hand, that the will is far from being free in the orthodox metaphysical sense, follows from the fact that no man is responsible for his character, or personality, which is in part congenital, in part an outcome of the cumulative action and reaction of past experiences,—a result of the working of manifold forces over which the individual as such has no control.

Thus, while admitting the well-known facts of consciousness,

the determinist denies all theological and transcendental conceptions of free will and stands firmly upon natural law.*

This being the case, it may be asked, how is it, then, that we are able consciously and deliberately to attempt not only to alter social and political institutions but also to take advantage of, and, in an increasing measure, to guide certain of the factors of social evolution? The answer to this question is, that every man has the power to transform his desires into conscious action, that, indeed, he must do so the moment his desires become motives, and there is no external force to prevent him. This is one of the commonest facts of experience. However, the real point at issue is not, are we able to exert will-power, but what gives direction to our will, by what is the will determined?—in other words, whence come our motives? Experience tells us that our motives are evidently a result of the reciprocal action of stimuli, generally coming from without, and character; and that in no case can motives be shown to be without antecedents. The stimulus may be an idea encountered in reading, which in turn awakens fresh impressions, or it may be a sensation giving rise to a sudden emotion, or a thought suggested by a speaker; in short, it may be anything that penetrates into the sphere of consciousness. But we are no less certain that personality is not a creation of the ego, in other words, of itself, than that we are not the creators of the stimuli upon which personality reacts. Yet we all have personality, and stimuli are thrust in upon us even in our sleep.

To say that it is folly for the determinist to act is absurd, considering that determinism is nothing more than a harmless scientific hypothesis which explains certain of life's phenomena, and as such prescribes no particular course of activity—or inactivity—to the individual. Indeed, the power to refrain from acting would under given conditions imply an independence of motives and personality, and consequently of natural law, which, far from being consistent with determinism, could only be explained by the metaphysical hypothesis of irresponsible free will!

That the sphere of conscious action is widening, that our conscious actions are becoming more and more efficient and better adapted to their ends—that we are getting a firmer and firmer grasp on our own destiny,—indeed, that the knowledge we have of evolution in its bearings on social questions is an important factor to this end, is no less true and no less consistent with the teachings of evolutionary science, than the fact that

*The will, if free, must be independent of the law of causality, that is to say, transcendental metaphysicians have long shown a preference for settling such questions as are dangerous to the interest of their preconceived dogmas to deny, yet impossible to demonstrate, by translating them from this world into the next,—a process of canonisation abundantly to be met with in the history of philosophy and religion.

what we call our destiny, important as it may be to us, is but the subjective side of a natural process, which, so far as we know, is absolute. Thus, although we may say that men have the capacity to co-operate with other forces in effecting changes in their environment, it is equally true that

"Nature is made better by no mean,
But nature makes that mean: over that art
Which you say adds to nature is an art
That nature makes"—

and that human experience knows no exception to this rule.

It is clear that the doctrine of theology, like that of freedom, when stripped of its metaphysical features, finally resolves itself into the identification of certain psychological elements with the ego, which psychological elements are, as we have already stated, a result of the action of forces which experience tells us are entirely beyond the control of the agent.

The question in which we socialists are most interested is not *are* we able to effect relative changes in our social and economic environment—a thing that nobody doubts—but *to what extent* can we consciously alter existing conditions, social and economic: what may be accomplished by the *direct* effects of conscious action, individual and collective, what part is played in social evolution by the *indirect* and *involuntary* effects of conscious action, and what part is played by the wholly unconscious in moulding our destiny? But to these questions no satisfactory reply can be given until an analysis of the factors of social evolution, more accurate and exhaustive than any that has so far been attempted, is placed at our disposal. And although Karl Marx, greatest of economists and sociologists, has presented us in his materialistic,* or economic, conception of history with a firm basis from which to set out on our further investigations, and at the same time has opened up to our view the immensity of the unconscious element in human development, we are still far from having arrived at a clear understanding of the relation which the dominant economic factor bears not only to the subordinate social forces, ideological and otherwise, with which it stands in reciprocal action, but also to our physical surroundings, the frame across which is stretched the very warp and woof of our existence.

However, it can safely be said, that with the gradual increase

*It need hardly be said that the materialistic conception of history has no necessary connexion with philosophical materialism. Whether Karl Marx and Friederich Engels were philosophical materialists, I do not know,—some authorities say they were and others that they were not, and the question seems so far to have received no very definite answer; but however this may be, the materialism or non-materialism of each was his own private affair,—a thing quite apart from their theory of history, which, like the theory of evolution with which it stands in such intimate relation, is concerned with matters dynamic and not statistical.

in our knowledge of social conditions, there is a corresponding development in our capacity to foresee the consequences of our actions, and with it a widening of the sphere of effective voluntary effort. And one very important reason for our supposing that the direct results of our political and economic action will be more considerable than have ever before been achieved in history, lies in the fact that the aim of socialism is not to destroy one class for the advantage of another class, but to break down all material class interests and distinctions for the benefit of the entire human race. We know not only that the involuntary and indirect results of the struggle of economic interests are a classic illustration of the past (and present) helplessness of capitalism and the ruling class in general to control even their *immediate* future, but also that the struggles themselves have from the earliest times supplied nourishment to all that is most primitive, irresponsible, and brutal in mankind. The moment society is organized on a basis of collectivism, the moment the merciless, deadening struggle for existence in economic and social life is replaced by co-operation and mutual aid, the greatest source of blind, ineffective action that history has ever known will be eliminated. It is not too much to say that its disappearance will mark the birth of a "new humanity."

HENRY BERGEN.

Munich, Ger.

A Statement and Denial.

SO untrue and unjust are recent press reports concerning my wife and myself, and so terribly false their implications as to socialist men and doctrines, that I feel compelled to give them an explicit public denial. Not that I have any hope of counteracting by means of a brief statement, the effects of wide misstatement that have occupied pages in our daily journals, and that have been read by millions of people. I can only hope that some of the serious-minded may read what I herein set forth, and accept it for the truth that it is:

1. According to these reports, Mrs. Herron and myself have recently inherited from her mother, Mrs. E. D. Rand, eleven millions of dollars, all of which sum is to be devoted to the destruction of the family and of religion. Now, Mrs. Rand never had eleven million dollars, nor one million dollars to bequeath to any one. Her whole estate does not amount to one-twelfth of what the press reports her to have left to her daughter. And the bulk of that twelfth does not go to Mrs. Herron at all but is held by trustees to be equally divided among Mrs. Rand's six grandchildren as they respectively become twenty-eight years of age, during which time one-half of the income is to be devoted to the founding of a school of socialism in New York city, with Mrs. Herron and Mr. Morris Hillquit as its trustees.

2. It is stated that there is gathered at Elmwood Farm, our home near Metuchen, New Jersey, a colony of people who are putting in practice the supposed doctrines that are destructive to the family and to religion. There is not, there has not been, nor has there been any intention or dream of having, a colony of any sort whatsoever at the Elmwood Farmstead. The place was an old and neglected colonial farm, which we bought four years ago, in the first place, as a home for my father and mother, who are conservative Presbyterians and Republicans, and also are the only people who have lived on the place, aside from the superintendent and employes. We also thought of the homestead and land as a place where we could work out of doors in the summer months, while giving hospitality to friends in need of rest, and while making a piece of practically waste earth fruitful and beautiful again. The only cottages on the place are those occupied by the farmer, the mechanic and the gardener. The persistent story of a colony at Elmwood Farm is pure invention and neither in fact nor intention has such a colony ever existed. It is to be hoped that this statement will forever set the matter at rest.

3. It is reported that I and my "followers" are engaged in a crusade against marriage, and that I am writing a book, to be published in all lands and all languages, that is meant for the destruction of the family. I am not writing, and never expect to write any such book nor am I engaged in any crusade against the family. In the real sacredness of the real family none of our accusers believe so devoutly as my wife and myself. One of our complaints against a capitalist civilization is that it is destroying both the economic and sympathetic basis on which the family can alone be built. The only crusade upon which I have been engaged is that of the working class for its emancipation from a capitalist society that I believe to be already rotten to the heart and brazen in every feature. Furthermore, I never had, never sought, and would not consent to have "followers" of any kind whatsoever. I am myself but an humble and unimportant follower of the International Socialist movement for the overthrow of the hideous and depraved capitalism which at present dooms the people of all nations to slavery, misery and hypocrisy.

4. For the millionth time, it is reported that Mrs. Herron and I took each other for "companions" nearly four years ago, and that we were not duly and legally married. This again is unqualified and malign invention. No such expressions as those used by the press, and by certain sordid novels, were ever used. We were married legally and even conventionally. The only thing in which the marriage differed from any marriage service, was that the clergyman used the word "announce" instead of "pronounce," and that each of the friends present was asked to express some chosen sentiment as a part of the ceremony.

Finally, it is only after painful and reluctant consideration that I send out this statement. In the unimaginable falsehood and warfare to which my wife and I have been subjected, for now more than four years, whenever our names have been publicly mentioned, I have made no reply and no defense. Nor is this mere statement of facts a defense of anything that we are, or do, or teach. In the end, it is only the lives of men or women, and the truth that is in them, that can defend them and if the truth of their lives cannot justify them, then nothing else can and if the truth cannot finally care for its own, then the world has no justice to give that is worth having. Besides, it seems to me that the manner by which my wife and I were married, and the things I am supposed to teach, have occupied a place in the public press, and, hence, in the public mind, out of all proportion to their significance. What I do, or do not, what I teach or do not teach, is very unimportant, and it is humiliating to be forced to assume them to be important enough to demand a defense against injustice and misstatement. And it is only out of deference to the cause of Socialism to which such life as I have belongs that I

put forth this correction in order that the Socialist movement and its doctrines may not be misread in the light in which I have been presented to the people by the reports referred to. While not expecting for a moment that this statement can efface the long effect of evil report from the popular mind, I can at least hope that facts herein given may have weight with some, and that there is still enough fairness in the press to allow me to set forth this much of truth against the volumes of unthinkable falsehood that have appeared. I furthermore hope that this statement may be accepted as final, especially as my wife and I are leaving to make our home indefinitely in a foreign land.

GEORGE D. HERRON.

Surplus Value and its Division.

WE HAVE seen in the last article that the value of a commodity is determined by the amount of labor which society will necessarily have to expend for its reproduction. This applies to all commodities, including that peculiar commodity upon which the whole capitalist system rests—labor power. All the mystery surrounding the production and distribution of the capitalist system, which we have noted above, is due to the presence of this peculiar commodity which was absolutely unknown to any former system of society. In no social system before the advent of capitalism was human labor power an independent commodity which could be trafficked in the market. A man's labor-power was deemed such an intimately personal attribute that it could not be considered apart from the man himself. The man himself might be free or unfree. If he was free his labor power was his own, used by himself for himself. If he was unfree, he, including his labor-power with his other personal attributes, belonged to his master. But in either case his labor power was inseparable from his body, was part and parcel of his personality as much as his personal appearance, and went with it.

It was only with the advent of capitalism that a man's labor power became separated from his body and person, when his labor power was "abstracted" from his personality and gained an independent existence. Then human labor power "as such," human labor power in the abstract, human labor power unidentified by an individual characteristic and severed from any *personal* relation, became an independent commodity to be trafficked in the open market. It is the appearance of this commodity historically that made capitalism possible, and it is due to its peculiar nature that so much mystery surrounds the workings of that system, upon which it has indelibly stamped its own characteristics.

The new commodity of *abstract* human labor, bought and sold in the open market independent and irrespective of any individual or personal relation, is, at the same time, part and parcel of the commodities which constitute the stock-on-hand of the capitalist world as well as the source of all the other commodities on hand. It is also its own source and creator, being the means of its own reproduction. As the general source and creator of capitalistic commodities, this abstract human labor is the source, and therefore, the measure of the exchange value of those commodities. As its own source and reproducer it is its own source and measure of value. That is to say, the measure of the value

of the capitalist commodity "general human labor power" is the amount of this labor power necessary for its reproduction under the social conditions of production existing at the time when it is dealt in on the market. This dual position of the commodity general human labor power is what has mystified and baffled the investigators into the laws of production and distribution of capitalist society. When this dual position is properly understood the mystery vanishes, and the anatomy and physiology, as well as the psychology of capitalist society are revealed to the mind's eye, so that their construction and *modus operandi* can be studied in detail.

We have seen already that the value of a commodity is determined by the amount of labor which will necessarily have to be expended in its production. This amount of labor will have to be bought in the open market by the producer in the shape of labor power, potential labor, and he will have to pay for it, barring accidents, *its* value. That is to say, he will have to pay the value of the labor necessary to produce this labor power, or, in other words, he will have to pay, in the form of wages, the amount of goods which the laborer consumes while exerting his labor power. This amount will vary, of course, with the productivity of labor in general, and with the standard of living of the workmen. But it will invariably be less than the amount of goods produced by the laborer in this exertion of his labor power. This is a prerequisite not only of capitalist production, but of any social form of production wherein a part only of the members of society are actively engaged in the work of production. In other words, in our capitalist system where a man sells his labor power to another man for a certain number of hours every day in consideration of a certain wage, the amount of labor necessary in order to produce the product represented by his wage is always smaller than the total amount of labor which he sold to his employer. As general human labor can only be measured by the time during which the labor power was exerted, it is the same thing as saying that the time required to produce a man's wages is always shorter than the time for which he was hired by the payment of these wages.

The amount of labor spent in reproducing the product which goes to the laborer as his wages may be called "necessary labor," for the reason that it is absolutely necessary in order to make further production or even existence itself on the same plane possible. The amount of labor, on the other hand, which the laborer puts in above the "necessary labor" we may call "surplus labor," for the reason that it is an overplus or addition to the amount of "necessary labor" which the laborer had already put in. The product which is produced in the "necessary labor" time, and its value may, for the same reasons be called "necessary" product,

and its value—"necessary" value; and the product produced in the "surplus labor" time, and its value—"surplus" product or value. In using the words "necessary" and "surplus" in characterizing the different parts of labor, product, or value, we do not intend to convey any meaning of praise or justification in the case of the one, nor of condemnation or derogation in the case of the other. We use them in their purely technical sense, with absolutely no "ethical" or "appreciative" significance.

This *surplus value* being constantly produced by the commodity labor power which the capitalists engaged in production constantly employ in their business, is the secret and mysterious source of all the wealth and revenue which falls to the share of those classes of capitalist society, who, without producing themselves, and without either by force or cunning appropriating to themselves what others produced, are still found in possession of quite a considerable share of the worldly goods of our society. Because of the peculiar faculty of the commodity labor-power to produce a surplus-product representing surplus-value, the *capitalist class* is enabled to obtain a part of the annual product of society without *taking* it from the producers.

When, at the end of a day, week, month, or year, the manufacturer is in possession of the finished product, that product contains the "necessary" as well as the "surplus" value. In the "necessary" value is included not only the wages paid to the workingmen but also the "capital" that went into the product, or rather, that part of capital which Marx calls "constant," that is to say, raw material, machinery charges, etc. Of course, all these things at one time, when they were produced, represented "necessary" as well as "surplus" value; when they are used, however, in production, that part of the product which simply reproduces their value is "necessary" for the same reason that the part representing the wages is "necessary." The "surplus" which he finds himself thus possessed of is therefore a clear *surplus* over and above all his expenditures and investment. It is pure *revenue* or *profit*. The amount of the surplus-value produced, and therefore of the revenue or profit derived by the manufacturer, depends, aside from the mere length of the working day, as already stated, on the state of the productivity of labor in general and the mode of living of the workingmen. That is to say, on the proportion of the "necessary" to the "surplus" in the labor performed by the laborer during the period of his employment. The length of the work day given, the productivity of labor, and the mode of living of the workingmen affect this proportion in opposite directions: a higher mode of living increases the "necessary" part of the labor, and higher productivity its "surplus" part.

After the surplus value is produced by the laborer in the surplus time that he works, the fund from which the capitalist

class as a class derives its revenue and "saves" its wealth is ready for its use and it becomes merely a question of its distribution among the different members of the class. This distribution is no simple matter, as it is done for the most part without the participants meeting each other, often without their knowledge, and always without their consent. This distribution is accomplished by the laws governing capitalist production, and automatically. In so far, of course, as such distribution is according to rule, normal. There is always, however, the possibility of one capitalist getting the better of the other, and the individual capitalist invariably attempts to do so. Whether or no these attempts are successful makes, however, no difference in this connection, as was already shown at length above. It is the *rule* of capitalist society that we are concerned with. The problem that confronts us, therefore, is: how does that part of the surplus value which, after its production by the workingmen, is in the possession of the manufacturer, find its way into the hands of the other members of the capitalist class?

As was already indicated above, all value, and therefore also surplus value—is not realized until the product which is the embodiment of the value reaches its ultimate destination, the consumer, who takes it out of the market, disregards its exchange-value and enjoys its use-value. Before it has reached this, its ultimate destination, a commodity, while possessing exchange value possesses it only potentially. Exchange value, not being something intrinsically inherent in the commodity, but expressing merely a social relation of production and distribution, may at any time before its final realization, when it ceases to be exchange-value, be adversely affected by some social change. We have already seen that the exchange value of a thing is the amount of labor necessary for the reproduction, at the time when it is needed, that is to say, when it reaches the consumer. Before it has reached the consumer its exchange value is always liable to change. There is therefore really no telling what the surplus value contained in a commodity is until it has reached the consumer. It cannot reach the consumer, however, before it has gone through the process of circulation in which it is being bought and sold, that is, exchanged. In all these transactions its exchange value, as the same expresses itself in the price which it fetches, is estimated upon the basis of its exchange value when it finally reaches its economic goal.

In this process of circulation the surplus value contained in the product, as far as the persons connected in its division are concerned, is realized by piecemeal. Each party concerned in the production and circulation of the commodity until it fulfills its social mission gets his share of the surplus value therein contained when it leaves his hands, on a sale by him, and the pur-

chase price which he receives represents the "necessary" part of the value of the commodity together with the share of the surplus value thereof to which he and those who preceded him in the process are entitled. In this way the surplus product contained in a commodity when it is produced is gradually converted into surplus value as it "circulates" along, and the surplus value is taken up gradually as it is being realized; share by share, along its course. The division of the surplus value takes place in the circulation process, and expresses itself in the different prices at which it is sold in this process.

These different prices at which a commodity is sold at different stages of the circulation process seemed to us inexplicable before, and vexed us not a little. But they will be readily understood when we know that the sharing up of the surplus value takes place in this process. As each stage of the process is passed a share of the surplus value is realized and is added to its price. When the exchange value of a commodity is first realized, when the manufacturer sells it, it is only that part of its exchange value that is realized, and is expressed in the price which the manufacturer obtained for it, which represents the "necessary" value of the commodity and that part of its surplus value which the manufacturer receives as his profit. The merchant pays his price to the manufacturer knowing that the full surplus value contained in the commodity has not yet been realized and expecting to realize a further share thereof for his own benefit upon a resale of the commodity to the retailer or consumer. This does actually happen in the usual course of business. This operation is repeated until the commodity passes the necessary stages of its circulation and reaches its social destination—the consumer—when the full surplus value contained in the commodity is realized in the purchase price paid by the consumer. This price represents the full value of the commodity "necessary" as well as "surplus."

The rules in accordance with which the different "interests" share in the surplus-value, and in accordance with which the different prices are paid for the commodity at the successive stages of the circulation process are themselves the result of the peculiar nature of the capitalist system stamped upon it by the peculiar commodity which lies at its foundation—labor power. The profit-sharing of the capitalist class is therefore absolutely impersonal. It also requires absolute freedom of movement for the different elements which go into the process of production and distribution. Wherever there is no absolute freedom of movement the laws governing the division of the surplus-value among the different capitalists are interfered with arbitrarily and may even be abrogated. This is a necessary corollary to the observation already made that all the laws of value and consequently the production

and realization of the surplus-value require absolute freedom of movement.

The presence in the market of the laborer offering for sale his labor power presupposes the presence in the same market of the capitalist seeking employment for his capital. Labor power as a commodity presupposes that the laborer who has this power for sale is not in possession of the tools of production necessary in order to exercise this power in the process of production. It presupposes a high state of technical development of production. Such a state of development that the productivity of labor is considerably above that stage where it can merely reproduce itself, yielding a large surplus-value, and that a large portion of the surplus value must be "saved" for the purpose of being used as a means of future production. It also presupposes that the "saved" portions of the surplus-value produced in the past are not in the hands of the laborers who offer for sale their labor-power. The possessors of these "saved" portions of past surplus-values, the capitalists, use these "savings," *capital*, in the production of further surplus-value, by the aid of the labor power which they purchase for part of it, in order to take it all to themselves. It is not, however, the capitalist personally who acquires the surplus-value. Capital, congealed and concentrated surplus-profit, produced by labor power, is just as impersonal, just as abstract, as its parent, labor-power. It is capital *as such*, irrespective of the capitalist who owns it, that gobbles up all the surplus value. The capitalist personally may sometimes by his ingenuity cause his capital to produce some extra surplus-value which other, less ingenious, capitalists could not do. In that even it goes to him personally as an extra profit. The ordinary, regular profits, however, of capitalist production and trade go to the credit of the capital employed, not the capitalist personally.

In order to produce a certain commodity and realize its value, that is bring it to the ultimate consumer and obtain from him its price, a certain amount of capital must necessarily be employed for a certain length of time. The amount of capital necessary to be employed therein at the different periods of the processes of production and circulation, and for how long a time at each period, will vary, of course, with the state of development of the means of production and exchange, including the means of transportation and communication and other facilities for the circulation of commodities in any given society at any given time. But under given conditions of production and circulation the amounts of, and lengths of time for which capital is necessarily employed in order to produce a commodity and bring it to the consumer remain the same.

We have already seen before that while all the surplus-value

contained is produced in the process of the commodity's production while it is in the possession of the manufacturer, this surplus-value is divided among all the capitalists who are concerned in the production and circulation of the commodity, while the same remains in the circulation process. Strictly speaking, however, as was already observed before, the surplus-value is not divided among the different capitalists concerned in the production and circulation of the commodity, but among the different capitalists employed in these two processes through which the life-course of each commodity runs. The distributive share of each of these capitals in the surplus value is proportionate to its own size and the length of time it was necessarily employed in either the production or the circulation of the commodity. That is to say, the total amount of capital, measured by a given unit, say a dollar, employed during all the time, measured by a given unit, say a day, that the commodity was necessarily in the process of production and circulation, is footed up, and the amount of surplus-value contained in the commodity is divided by that total, giving a certain amount of surplus-value per unit of capital per unit of time, which we will call the rate of profit. The distributive share of each capital is, then, the product of its own size x the time it was employed x the rate of profit.

When the manufacturer sells the commodity, at its first appearance as a commodity and the first realization of its value, the price which he receives and in which his value is realized, is not its final price expressing its actual value when it is ready to perform its full social function in the hands of the consumer. It is merely an intermediate price. Marx calls it "Price of production." This intermediary price is based on the ultimate price of the commodity to be received from the consumer in accordance with its value. It is by this expected ultimate price representing its full value that the amount of surplus-value contained in it is ascertained. When the fact that the commodity contains a surplus-value and its amount are ascertained, the Price of Production is determined by the "necessary" value contained in it plus the distributive share of the manufacturer's capital in the surplus-value. The "necessary" value contained in the commodity represents the cost of its production to the manufacturer. That does not mean, however, that the manufacturer simply gets a return of what he has expended in the production of the commodity. It is not the *actual* expense of production that is represented in its "necessary" value, but the *socially necessary* expense of producing the commodity at the time the manufacturer sells it. If the actual cost of production is above that the manufacturer loses the difference; if it is below he pockets the difference as an extra profit.

The prices paid at any succeeding stage of the circulating process are fixed in the same way. Each succeeding seller gets in the price which he receives the necessary value of the commodity plus the distributive share of the surplus-value to which he and his predecessors in the process are entitled in accordance with the rules formulated above. Each of them gets his own distributive share of the surplus-value in addition to what he has paid or laid out. Provided, of course, he bought and sold at its fair price. Otherwise, one of them may get more than his due share and another less. But all of the capitalists concerned, together, get all the surplus-value produced in the process of production, and no more. Unless, indeed, the workingmen did not get their fair pay or the consumer was compelled to pay an unfair price, in which event the capitalists immediately concerned reaped an extra profit. Or the workingmen were paid too much or the consumer paid too little, in which event the capitalists immediately concerned suffered a loss.

It was assumed all through this discussion that each capitalist worked with his own capital. If any one of them did not, he had to give up all or part of his share of the surplus-value, which he received in the form of profit, to the person from whom he borrowed his capital, in the shape of interest. This does not change the matter, however, and we are not concerned with it here. We also left out of the discussion the question of rent, and the question of additional work which may have to be performed on the commodity in the circulation process, as these questions in no wise affect the subject-matter of our investigation,—the laws governing the production of wealth in the capitalist system and the manner of its distribution among the different classes of capitalist society.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)

Public Defense in Criminal Trials.

IT is an axiom of the law that a person charged with crime is presumed to be innocent until found guilty. And yet society does all it can to convict him but almost nothing to secure for him an adequate defense. In the trial of such a person the prosecution is conducted by a public prosecutor employed by the state. This manner of prosecution has grown out of the belief that crimes are wrongs of so public a character that society has the right to prosecute the criminals.

But the defendant at the bar is forced to provide for his own defense. He, a single individual, must defend himself against the state, representing many individuals. If he is a Roland B. Molyneux, with thousands of dollars at his command, all may be well with him. Like Molyneux he may be able, even after the death sentence has been pronounced upon him, to appeal his case once, twice or three times, and, with the aid of the best legal talent, finally to secure an acquittal. But, on the contrary, he may be like the defendant in the following case.

An old woman was found dead in her home. Upon her body were marks which indicated a violent death. Circumstantial evidence caused suspicion to rest upon her husband, an old man of seventy, and he was arrested under the charge of murder in the first degree. In the city where this took place lawyers assigned by judges to defend pauper cases received no pay except in cases of murder in the first degree, for the defense of which there was a fee of five hundred dollars. A "shyster" lawyer who knew that this old man was too poor to employ counsel went to the judge and secured the assignment to the case. But the grand jury returned an indictment for manslaughter in the first degree. Since he could not hope for a fee for defending the old man against this charge the lawyer at once lost his interest in the case. In order to avoid the labor of trying the case he began to press the defendant to plead guilty. The old man refused, protesting his innocence. But the lawyer was helped by a long delay in bringing the case to trial because the public prosecutor found difficulty in securing enough evidence to ensure a conviction. This official was fond of boasting that he had already sent eighteen men to the electric chair. It gave him great pain to witness the acquittal of a single person charged with crime. He therefore delayed this trial in the hope of finding further evidence of this man's guilt. The presumption of the law that this man was innocent did not deter him from causing this delay.

Day after day the poor old man sat in his cell and brooded over the death of his wife. For nearly fifty years they had lived together and loved one another. So great was his grief at her death that he had wept beside her grave. And yet these representatives of the law accused him of having killed her. These accusations he met with indignant denial. When the lawyer whose duty it was to defend him suggested that he plead guilty he spurned the suggestion with vehemence. But the close confinement and rigid discipline of the prison rapidly weakened his courage and his strength. He knew that the public prosecutor was doing his best to convict him. His own lawyer was constantly pressing him to plead guilty. The hand of the law had its iron grip upon him and from it he saw no escape. For six months the ordeal continued. At last, broken in body and in spirit, he consented to plead guilty. The judge directed a probation officer to investigate the case. This investigation revealed facts which proved that the old man could not possibly have killed his wife. It was shown that her death was caused by a strange and unusual accident. When the judge learned these facts he directed that the plea of guilty be withdrawn and that there be a trial by jury. After verifying the facts presented by the probation officer the public prosecutor concluded that a conviction was impossible. He therefore asked that the defendant be discharged on his own recognizance. With trembling limbs the old man walked from the courtroom where he had so narrowly escaped receiving punishment. Were it not for the almost accidental investigation of the probation officer he would probably have been sentenced to twenty years imprisonment for a crime he had never committed. To have served a small part of this sentence would undoubtedly have killed him.

This story is but a single example of what is constantly occurring in the criminal courts. It shows that the present method of official defense is little better than a farce. When a defendant lacks the means with which to employ counsel it becomes the duty of the judge to instruct a lawyer practising in his court to take charge of the defense. What is the usual result? This lawyer officially appointed the counsel for the defense ascertains from the defendant his financial resources. His object is to determine whether there is any possibility of securing a fee for the services which it is his duty to perform. If there is no such possibility his wish is to dispose of the case with as little trouble as possible. To do this he tries, first of all, to persuade the defendant to plead guilty. If he succeeds he is relieved from the necessity of spending time and trouble in conducting the trial. The defendant, however, may protest his innocence and insist upon a trial. The lawyer will then give to the preparation for the trial as little time as possible. He gives to the defendant a poor and

weak defense in opposition to the carefully prepared prosecution of the prosecuting attorney. Thus great injustice is done to the defendant who is so unfortunate as to be unable to employ counsel. Many such defendants will plead guilty rather than be tried with so poor a defense.

To prevent such grave injustice a system of public defense should be established. Lawyers employed by the state as public advocates should conduct this defense. No person prosecuted for crime, who is too poor to employ counsel, would then lack efficient defense. Such legal officers called "advocates of the poor" used to exist in certain Italian provinces. It was their duty to act as counsel in all pauper cases. Unfortunately these offices were abolished at the time of the political reorganization of Italy. Enrico Ferri, the great Italian criminal sociologist, strongly favors their re-establishment. He says that these advocates "ought to be on a par with the public prosecutor," and to be substituted for the present institution of the official defense, which is a complete failure."

These advocates would stand ready to defend in all cases where the defendants are unable to employ counsel. But there are many reasons for extending this system of public defense to all criminal trials. To fully appreciate the force of these reasons it is necessary first of all to understand the theory underlying public prosecution. This theory has grown out of the belief that crimes are wrongs of a very public character. To protect itself against them society has assured the right to prosecute the criminals. Therefore, whenever a person charged with crime is brought before a court, the prosecution is conducted by an attorney employed by the state. Society does all it can to secure the conviction of the defendant. But it does little or nothing to secure for him an adequate defense. And yet it is true that criminals are created by society. If, therefore, society to protect itself has the right to prosecute them, they certainly have the right to demand of society a fair defense. And what of those innocent victims of public prosecution who are so many of the defendants in criminal trials. They have undergone suffering, humiliation and the loss of time and money by being forced to stand trial for the commission of crimes of which they are ultimately acquitted. In recompense for this they have the right to demand indemnification from society. The least that society can do for them is to provide them with adequate defense. And yet they are left entirely to their own resources to secure this defense. If they lack such resources they are given the existing form of official defense. This, as we have seen, is an utter failure.

This system of public defense in all criminal trials would make it much easier to abolish the present vicious method of allowing defendants to plead guilty. It would at least remove the worst

feature of this method. This feature of court procedure exists for the sake of expediting the business of the court. But it has resulted in a number of very grave abuses. A defendant in a criminal trial is brought before the bar and asked whether he wishes to plead guilty. Many defendants, through ignorance of court procedure, or, in the case of immigrants, of the English language, are incapable of understanding this question. It frequently happens that one of these, who is not represented by counsel, will answer affirmatively to this question. He will plead guilty without any intention of making such a plea. I have had the opportunity frequently of talking with prisoners who had thus unwittingly pleaded guilty. In the case of many of these, who still believed that they were to be tried, I have had the unpleasant task of informing them that all that was left for them now was the pronouncing of their sentence by the judge. Thus we see that it is possible under our present system of criminal procedure for a defendant to plead guilty unintentionally. This can happen because the defendant does not have adequate representation in the court. If a public advocate could have charge of the defense this could never happen.

On the other hand experienced criminals when charged with crime frequently take advantage of this method of pleading guilty. They will plead guilty with the utmost alacrity in order to secure the benefit of the leniency shown by the law and by judges as a reward. I was recently talking with a notorious criminal who has already spent four terms in state prisons of two states. He told me that it was his habit to plead guilty in order to secure the benefit of such leniency. He then began boasting of the short sentences he had served. It often happens that a first offender who has stood trial and been convicted will receive a longer sentence than an old offender who has pleaded guilty to the same crime. Such grotesque mistakes as these would rarely happen if a trial were held in each case. During the course of the trial the past record of each defendant would be thoroughly exposed in open court. It would then be possible to judge and to sentence, not only according to the nature of the crime, but also according to the character and past record of the criminal. Public defense would make it much more feasible to have a trial in every case because the public advocates would be ready to prepare carefully the defense. Thus each defendant would be certain of a fair trial.

This method of pleading guilty tempts a public prosecutor to urge a defendant to plead guilty. He does this in order to save himself the time and trouble of prosecuting the case. He may threaten the defendant with unusually severe punishment if he insists upon a trial. Or he may offer to allow him to plead guilty to a lesser crime than the one with which he is charged. Or he

may offer to ask the judge for great leniency if the defendant will plead guilty. As a result poor and ignorant defendants are frequently frightened or coerced into pleading guilty. No defendant should be made to feel that he is jeopardizing his interests by insisting upon a trial. By means of threats innocent persons have often been induced to plead guilty. Offers of leniency have helped notorious criminals to get off with less punishment than they deserved. The public advocate could shield the innocent defendant from the threat of the prosecuting attorney. A trial in each case would insure the meting out of adequate punishment to the criminal.

This system of public defense would almost entirely eliminate the so-called "shyster" lawyers. The harm sometimes done by these "shysters" is shown in the case of the old man charged with the murder of his wife. These creatures haunt every criminal court and prey upon poor and ignorant defendants, oftentimes bleeding them of all their property. The presence of many such defendants favors the existence of these lawyers. The precarious situation of these defendants makes them their easy prey. With public defense, however, all such cases of poor and ignorant defendants would be in the hands of the public advocate. Thus the field of action of the "shyster" lawyer would be destroyed.

The public advocate could do much more far-reaching work than the probation officer. This officer exists in certain of the courts of the states where probation or parole laws have been passed. His work is to prevent some of the abuses which have been described. As a rule he can have nothing to do with a case until the defendant has been convicted or has pleaded guilty. He is then directed by the judge to investigate the case. Having gathered as much information as possible he reports to the judge. He may also make some recommendation as to the best method of disposing of the case. Where the prisoner seems to have been convicted unjustly or where leniency seems desirable he recommends leniency. He may thus prevent to a very small extent some of the abuses which exist. But he is very much limited in his powers and his opportunities. His work is done in a more or less haphazard and incidental sort of a way and his success depends upon the judges under whom he is working. He is usually unable to influence a case until after the greatest injury has been done. Even then he is only able to alleviate in a slight degree the effects of this injury. The public advocate, on the contrary, would have charge of a case from the very beginning. He could almost entirely prevent all of the abuses which have been described. He would not allow a defendant to plead guilty unintentionally. He could prevent the conviction of innocent persons caused by the lack of efficient defense by lawyers appointed by the judge. The work of investigating the past record of pris-

oners about to be sentenced, now done by probation officers, could be done as well by the public advocate. In most cases he would already have made this investigation while conducting the trial. The public advocate would thus become the logical successor of the probation officer. He would supplement if not entirely supersede him in his work of mitigating the harshness of the law in cases where leniency is desirable.

The public advocate could frequently prevent long delays in bringing cases to trial. These delays are usually caused by the public prosecutor who is looking for further evidence of guilt. The public advocate could in the meantime be searching for evidence of innocence, and could demand a trial as soon as he had obtained this evidence. How different might have been the story of the old man charged with the murder of his wife. If a public advocate could have conducted the defense he would soon have had the evidence of innocence which was found so much later by the probation officer. He would then have demanded a trial, with the aid of this evidence, would have secured the acquittal of the old man. But the lawyer appointed by the judge was unwilling to take the time and trouble to find this evidence. In the meantime the old man was suffering the terrible ordeal of those long months in prison, which forced him finally to plead guilty. It was not until then that the probation officer was able to do the investigating which resulted in the release of the old man. Delay in the bringing of a case to trial is a great injustice to the defendant, especially if he is unable to give bail and is forced to wait in prison. The public advocate, by securing evidence of innocence, could in many cases prevent such delay.

The introduction of this system of public defense would probably meet much opposition from the bar. And yet from the point of view of the bar associations it should be favored. To be sure it would destroy the practice of the "shyster" lawyers. Many positions as public advocates would be created which should go to the better class of lawyers. Furthermore, a certain amount of the better kind of criminal practice would still remain. Public defense would not necessarily destroy all criminal practice for private lawyers. Defendants could still have the privilege of employing private counsel if they so desired. It is impossible to determine at present whether it would ever be well for the public advocate to allow a case to go entirely out of his hands. It might be well for him to have supervision in every case. The private counsel could then co-operate with him in conducting the trial. But public defense would tend to purify private criminal practice. It would eliminate the disreputable class of lawyers and the disreputable kinds of practice. But it would leave a large field for honorable and dignified practice, either as a public advocate or as a private counsellor.

Public defense would greatly increase the amount of recognition given to the defendant in a criminal trial. In this respect it would be in accord with the historical development of criminal procedure. In England, as late as 1836, no person prosecuted for any felony, except treason, had even the right to employ his own counsel. All those prosecuted for crime now have the privilege of securing their own counsel. It is now time for society to recognize its duty of providing efficient defense in every criminal trial. Under the present system of criminal procedure many innocent individuals have been sacrificed in the name of society. The object of this system is to check crime. And yet it breeds many criminals, for to punish innocent individuals is, as a rule, to make them criminals. Thus not only has great injustice been done to those sacrificed, but society also has suffered. With public defense the great majority of these would be acquitted and saved to society.

Public defense would also increase the amount of attention given to the criminal. To protect itself against crime society has developed criminal law and the machinery to enforce it. It has administered punishment according to the nature of the crime, but has almost entirely ignored the criminal. By so doing it has encouraged rather than suppressed criminal instincts. Occasional criminals are those who have committed crime more through misfortune or accident than through criminal instinct. Many men belonging to the great army of the unemployed steal to save themselves and their families from starvation. To send these men to prison is to make many of them confirmed criminals. In the meantime their families are left in greater destitution, thus increasing the temptation of the members of these families to commit crime. Many are tempted to commit crime by evil associates. These may be saved to society by the exercise of leniency. And yet in most of these cases through lack of efficient defense severe punishment is administered. By means of public defense each one of these criminals would receive a fair hearing in the court. Such punishment could then be meted out as would tend to increase criminal instincts. By so doing, not only would society be performing its duty of securing justice to these individuals, but would also be protecting itself against crime in the future.

If, then, we introduce a system of public defense, public advocates would stand ready to defend every person charged with crime whether guilty or innocent. No other single change in criminal procedure would do more to save the innocent person and the occasional criminal from an undeserved or a too severe punishment. Through the public advocate every person prosecuted for crime would have a full and fair opportunity to present to the court his past record, his character, and the circumstances under which he was charged to have committed crime. Thus the court

would be able to judge, not only according to the technically legal character of the crime, but also according to those far more important personal factors which should be considered in the decision of every criminal case.

MAURICE F. PARMELEE.

This plan of having paid public "defenders" as well as prosecutors has been adopted as a part of the public policy of nearly all European socialist parties and some of them include it in their platforms. While such a measure does not strike at the root of class justice, yet it offers so great an improvement on our present judicial procedure as to be well worth the attention of socialists.—EDITOR.

EDITORIAL

Government by Mimeograph.

We have had many exemplifications of government by injunction in the course of our industrial warfare, and from present developments it looks as though the socialist party was rapidly coming to be governed or at least administered by the mimeograph. Perhaps this is only one more illustration of the way in which a mechanical invention transforms institutions. The fatal facility with which a number of copies can be run off on this new invention practically makes every man his own newspaper and has led to a tremendous multiplication of "protests," "statements," "explanations," "suggestions," etc.

So long as this was confined to individuals who took their own time and paid their own expenses it was certainly nothing of which any one else could complain. But now that an attempt is being made to have the national office of the socialist party become the medium by which all these various effusions shall be prepared and distributed it is time for the membership of that organization, whose time and money is being so used, to protest.

It is probable that few even of the members of the national committee realize that nearly one third of the resources of the national office is now being used in sending out voluminous publications to a few party officials. So far has this now gone that to a large degree the national organization resembles the majority of the village churches in that it only lives to keep itself alive.

An examination of a late batch of mimeographed stuff shows that out of 21 pages, not over eight are devoted to matters which properly belong there. In addition to this matter a special circular has also been printed in order to give the various members of the quarreling organizations of Minnesota and intermeddling members from other states an opportunity to voice their very important opinions. Taken all together this costs each year far more than any weekly paper published by the socialists, with one single exception.

The question comes up as to what right these few persons have to

use the time and money of all of us to air their opinions on party matters, simply by sending any communications to be published "by request."

Nearly all of these communications have previously appeared in some party paper and in that way have already reached the membership. If these members are so anxious to air their valuable opinions let them send them to the various papers some of which are almost entirely devoted to such matter. Or, let them buy a mimeograph of their own. It should not be difficult for them to secure lists of all the persons to whom the national office sends its bulletins. Indeed there is no reason why the complete list of Locals should not be supplied to any one who is willing to pay for the trouble of having them copied.

The attempt which is sometimes made to keep them secret is only a part of the same tendency, that is now only too frequently exemplified, of the idea that the party membership needs a guardian. Some state secretaries and party officials seem to fear that if these lists were common property, the membership would be "corrupted." This assumption of lack of judgment is a gratuitous insult to the rank and file, without the slightest justification.

It is somewhat amusing, however, to note in this connection that the one state which has most jealously guarded its list of members is now sending forth a wail of complaint because it could not secure the list of other states to get its statement before the members. This whole subject of party guardianship and its accompanying idea that the machinery of the party as such is of paramount importance is one of the most deadening influences with which socialist progress has to contend at the present time. For proof of this it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that those cities in which these special guardians are most active are as a general rule the ones with the smallest party membership, the lowest vote, and in short with the least effective activity in all direction. The party organization exists to do a work. It is an organ with a function to perform, not a creation to be supported for itself. The very best way to develop an organ is to utilize it in the highest degree. The function of the party machinery is education, agitation, and organization. That organization will be the most effective, will have the clearest socialist principles, will do the most work which is kept continuously busy in the work of socialist activity.

On the other hand that party organization, local, state or national whose members occupy their time only with discussions of the machinery of party activity will soon find itself attacked with a sort of dry rot which will paralyze all activity and end with the destruction of the machine itself. Only by use, can the form of party organization be determined and there is little use of the organism when its entire strength is used in self examination.

Along with this same attitude of mind goes an exaggerated idea of the importance of official position. This seems to have attacked some of our national committeemen quite badly, until they consider that the

entire party is lying awake nights to learn what their individual opinions are on party matters. They do not look upon themselves as servants of the party to carry on the work of agitation and education, and extension of organization, but rather as monitors and guardians whose business it is to see that the membership do not wander from the straight and narrow path, and are furnished with frequent official opinions as to their own duties and activities. To them the only party news is party quarrels, the only form of party activity the criticism of party machinery. The fact that the city of Milwaukee has acted very foolishly in relation to some forms of party organization is considered of much more importance than that it has carried on the most active socialist propaganda of perhaps any city of similar size in the United States. That Minnesota is now torn by internal dissensions, and that a couple of her officials have sought to exercise a little brief authority, becomes of a great deal more importance than the fact that the entire national organization is handicapped by lack of literature and speakers. This does not say that breaches of party tactics should not be rebuked or punished, neither that the form of organization should be neglected, but merely that these are not the only thing with which the party machine is concerned. Neither does it follow that the half dozen members of the national committee who have been most busily occupied along these lines have been especially selected by nature for the position of party guardians. It is probable that the membership in Minnesota and Wisconsin is as intelligent as that in most of the other states, and it is certain that they can take care of their own business better than one or two committeemen from other states. If there is one point where discipline is needed today and needed badly it is with regard to those officials who are usurping the powers that belong to the membership, who are hampering the work of the entire movement, who are exhausting the energies of the national office and cramming the columns of our party press with petty details (such as many a local settles every few months without any disturbance whatever) to the exclusion of the infinitely more important work that lies before us.

A very good idea of how the national office is now looked upon by the members of the national committee is given by the motion recently made by Comrade Work of Iowa to strike out that portion of the state and municipal program providing for a municipal secretary. It is evidently impossible for some members of the present national committee to see the use of a man in the national office who should be engaged in anything else besides running a mimeograph, to preserve and circulate the precious opinions of party officials concerning each others actions. As a matter of fact this is the most essential portion of the entire program, since it alone provides for effective continuous work. In his comment he declares that this provides for a fifth and sixth wheel to the party machinery, and states that "the committees already existing should have general charge of the matter." Unfortunately these committees have

shown themselves hopelessly incapable of taking charge of anything, as witness what a bungle they have made of such a very simple thing as the issuing of a few propaganda pamphlets. On the other hand the national secretary and his assistants have, on the whole, shown a willingness and capacity for doing things, when unhampered by such fifth wheels as the National Executive Committee.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

At the recent convention of the metal polishers and affiliated crafts at St. Louis the following proposition was adopted:

"Resolved, That the Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers, Brass Molders, Brass and Silver Workers' Union of North America recommend all affiliated workers to study the principles and philosophy of socialism; be it further

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to devise a plan of action in harmony with the spirit and letter of the above declaration, to be submitted to the next convention of the American Federation of Labor."

As has been pointed out in the REVIEW, at the recent referendum, A. B. Grout, of Kenosha, Wis., formerly of Chicago, was elected general president. Grout is an ardent Socialist and a hard-working, conscientious young man, and he is going to make his mark in the labor movement. During the past few years there is no organization in the country, excepting the Western Federation of Miners, that has been up against so many desperate fights as the polishers. In nearly every large industrial center of the country the capitalists of the Parry stripe have attacked this union with a vindictiveness second only to that of the Russian nobility in the attempt to mow down the workers. And yet the polishers and brassworkers, whose organization is formed along industrial lines, have withstood the onslaught quite successfully, and, instead of being cowed into submission and enslaved, they have learned the object lessons and are moving ahead to educate the membership to a full understanding of their position in society. The St. Louis convention acted wisely. Had they jammed through a resolution to endorse the Socialist party it would have meant nothing. But to declare in favor of studying the principles and philosophy of socialism means that the locals (and I know many of them in which the active workers are Socialists) will invest in Socialist literature and lectures and still further educate the men in the trade.

I have it from absolutely reliable sources—from the mouth of a so-called commissioner and indirectly from an operator—that next spring will see a general suspension of work in the bituminous districts of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, and quite likely in Iowa, Michigan and less important mining states. "You see," said one of these gentlemen, "there is too much coal being mined and there is constant danger of prices being depressed. There are too many mines being operated—more than the market needs—and thousands of tons are being piled up that can't be sold. There they lay and money is tied up in them, and in the midst of this wealth hard times are actually staring us in the face." He admitted that even if the miners accepted lower wages it would not change the situation to any appreciable extent; he also admitted that the workers

are hard pressed and are employed but three or four days a week, and dismissed the whole subject by declaring that there are "too many mines in operation and too many workers depending upon the industry for an existence." Here is a text for every Socialist soap-box orator in the country. Under the present planless, anarchistic-capitalistic method of production tens of thousands of miners have worked too hard, even under the eight-hour day system, and they and their families will be compelled to suffer and starve while the wealth they produced and do not own is being consumed. In the anthracite field in Pennsylvania the condition is quite similar, except perhaps that the operators, taking advantage of the so-called over production, are imbued with the vindictive notion of enforcing the open-shop policy and destroying the union. So that a year or so hence, unless all signs fail, thousands of miners will be in want and other thousands of workers will stand in good chance of freezing because of the high price of coal, and because the god of profit must have his sacrifices under capitalism.

And this brings me to another very important point that the workers of this country ought to understand. In conversation with a man who holds a responsible position in the service of the United States government, and who travels about the country and comes in contact with capitalists in every line of industry, who occasionally unbosom themselves regarding labor matters, I have learned that the optimistic claims of our friend Gompers and his followers that the capitalists are abandoning their open-shop policy are wholly without foundation. It is well known that in nearly every contest of national significance between the organized capitalists and the organized workers upon the open-shop question the latter have lost—at least temporarily—and it is a fact that the capitalists have become more fully aroused and have gone ahead and strengthened their lines much more rapidly than we, probably largely for the reasons that they have fewer people to organize and are quicker to understand their interests as a class. However, to get back to the government agent. In a certain city, in which the Parryites had been particularly active in fighting the unions in the building and metal trades, the printing office proprietors were slow to declare for the open-shop policy, undoubtedly because the printers had practically every plant organized. The "commissioner" (or talking agent) of the employers' association approached the owners of the printing establishments and urged them to stand for the open shop. He received little satisfaction, the bosses declaring that it would mean a hard and long fight with the printers and affiliated craftsmen. In a few days thereafter a multi-millionaire in the metal trades visited the largest printing office proprietor in the city and said: "Mr. Blank, you do not do printing for yourselves; you depend upon us. Now I am unalterably in favor of the open shop. I had a fight with my men and it cost me a large sum of money to enforce the principles that I believe in. You ought to join us in repelling the demands of these trade unions. You cannot expect me to contract with your firm for catalogue work and other printing if you meekly submit to your employes and thus encourage ours to organize and make unreasonable demands." Other manufacturers had interviewed with their boss printers and in a short time the latter surrendered completely, and, instead of "running their business to suit themselves," they hung up open-shop signs, forced a strike, gave the "commissioner" full charge to supply rats, and spent thousands upon thousands of dollars to defeat the men with whom they had been upon friendly terms, big bunches of money coming from the Parryites to aid the employers. Similar tactics have been pursued in a number of other cities that I might name if it were policy to do so, and it looks as though the scheme outlined above has become a general one among the capitalistic union-smashers.

The brutality and coercion of the Parryites surpasses anything that has ever been attempted by unions. Ruination and beggary stares in the face those who dare to defy the Parry edicts. The open shop demand of the capitalists is one of the greatest issues of our time, and unfortunately the craze has seized hold of employers who are not identified with capitalistic associations, and they parrot the Parryite phrases as though they were really the defenders of the people's liberties, instead of being engaged in a campaign, which, if successful, will mean complete slavery for the workers. No other hostile acts—no police or military brutality, no court injunctions, no enactment of vicious laws—have so thoroughly aroused the organized toilers of the country to a realization of the fact that a class struggle is raging, which threatens to force hard conditions upon them and their children, as this open shop movement. You hear the unionists discussing it wherever you go, and the sentiment in favor of carrying the war to the political field is sweeping throughout the country despite all that can be done by the so-called pure and simple leaders to discourage political action through the Socialist party, as well as the hysterical efforts of the professional politicians to obscure this momentous question. The cry of the workers to-day is much like that of the men of the last generation: "This country cannot be half free and half slave—we will preserve the union at any cost!" And the methods of the employers are not unlike those of the slave power of the South before the sixties—we have the Legrees of the Parry stripe and the St. Clairs of the Nelson kind. The courts have given us new Dred Scott decisions, and we also have our Kansas-Nebraska compromises, and the bull pens of Colorado may prove the Bull Run of the modern struggle, which, judging from every indication, is increasing in severity and will not be settled until it is settled right. At this juncture no Socialist can afford to dicker and waste valuable time in splitting hairs. It is his duty to take a broad, tolerant position so far as working class policies are concerned and to embrace every opportunity to aid in educating the masses to a proper understanding of the dangers that confront them and the right solution of the labor problem.

The long and bitter struggle that has been waged by the brewery workers on the one hand and the engineers and firemen on the other for jurisdiction over employes in brewing establishments will be forced into the background at the coming A. F. of L. convention by the quarrel that has broken out between the longshoremen and the seamen. For several years the longshoremen have been branching out upon industrial lines and absorbing practically every craft on and along the waterways upon the North American continent. The seamen's officials have watched the encroachments of the "land lubbers" with a jealous eye, and, fearing that they would be swallowed sooner or later by the industrial whale, made an attack upon the longshoremen, who, in order to absorb certain crafts whose members float upon the bounding billows, attached the words "Transport Workers" to their official name. The sailor men protested to the A. F. of L. against granting their rivals the right to change their name and were sustained, but the longshoremen not only retained the prescribed words, but continued to reach for members upon the waters. Thereupon the seamen brought their troubles into the San Francisco convention of the Federation, and a hard fight was made which resulted in a draw. During the past year, however, a secession has developed in the longshoremen's organization on the Pacific Coast and the sailors are openly aiding the bolters, and, quite naturally, the longshoremen are threatening dire retaliation. Both national bodies will demand that the charter of its opponent be revoked at the Pittsburg convention of the A. F. of L. next month, and there promises to be a struggle between the industrialists and autonomists, such as has never been seen before. In this connection it

might be added that certain national officers of both organizations have not hesitated to charge upon the floor of the Federation, whenever their policies were questioned by delegates who are Socialists, that the latter were trade union disrupters and an all-around suspicious lot. But now they seem to be tarred by their own stick, and, instead of the Socialists being shining marks for their unjust attacks, the "reds" will probably be given a rest—at least while the other fellows are busy proclaiming the villainy of their hated rivals. An effort is also to be made in this convention to prevent jurisdiction wars being injected into the annual sessions by forcing the contending unions to settle their own troubles or agree that the decisions arrived at by the delegates, when called upon to pass judgment, shall be final. Whether this scheme will work out or not is problematical. A Federation convention without a bunch of jurisdiction scraps would be like a Donnybrook fair whose patrons had all suddenly become angels. And yet it is high time that something were done to put an end to the wasteful jurisdiction fights, so that a solid front could be presented to the common enemy.

The journeymen tailors and the garment workers are in a fair way to end their jurisdiction disputes. Throughout the present year officials of those organizations have been negotiating plans for an amalgamation of both unions, and while a slight hitch occurred at the last moment it is believed that all differences will be overcome and unity will prevail.

The eight-hour movement of the printers has been started earlier than expected. The journeymen did everything in their power to obtain a peaceful adjustment of the matter, but their overtures were met with lockouts in a number of cities, whereupon the union declared a general strike against the employers' organization and is now engaged in battle. The printers have already won their demands in several hundred small towns and are making steady gains in the larger cities.

Although the general election in the International Association of Machinists was held in August, the result of the balloting is not yet known. The latest reports are to the effect that the tally sheets were lost, strayed or stolen in Washington. The official ballot, owing to the lack of some rational system in making nominations, was the worst jumble that was ever known in any labor organization. It was about a mile long, and at a glance an outsider would imagine that nearly every member in the I. A. M. was running for office. It is being charged that the administration was opposed to the referendum and purposely allowed it to become farcical, and that all the nominations, complimentary or otherwise, were submitted to the membership in order to divide the field and re-elect the present officers. Whether or not those charges are true remains to be seen.

It is reported that Mat Cummerford, a Socialist, has defeated John E. Brunner as general president of the National Association of Steam Engineers. Brunner was a Democratic politician in Cincinnati and was largely responsible for the bad feeling that was engendered between the brewers and the engineers and firemen.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

SWEDEN.

Sweden at the present time seems to be in the grasp of reaction. A law has been passed which practically makes striking a crime. This law was particularly directed at the railroad employees. Nevertheless their organization has grown with great rapidity since the enactment of these laws and, supported by the other unions, now announces that if any attempt is made to enforce the law a general strike will be at once declared. In the meantime the socialist vote is steadily increasing. Elections have been going on all through the month of September. Full reports have not yet been received but the socialists have already won some votes where they had none before and have made large gains everywhere.

FRANCE.

One of the most striking developments of the French socialist movement at present is the great increase in the number of socialist teachers. At a recent congress of the French teachers held at Lille the socialists were practically in control. A resolution was presented providing that in the study of history the aim should always be the creation of a revolutionary attitude in the sense of the revolution of 1792. This was intended to be an expression of bourgeois radicalism, but it was thought by the use of the word "revolution" that socialist votes might be caught by it. Socialists refused to be caught by this bait but introduced and carried a resolution instead that history must be considered as a science, and not utilized for the development of any particular theory. A second resolution also dealt with revolutionary phrases, but was in fact intended as endorsement of capitalistic patriotism. In response to this the socialists introduced and carried the following resolution:

"The French teachers are unqualified defenders of peace, they have as their motto 'war against war,' but this does not prevent them from defending their country when it shall be the subject of a brutal aggression."

The reactionary press have declared that this resolution is simply a repetition of the International Socialist position and are attacking the teachers' organization. This organization which includes 115,000 teachers has voted to adopt the position of a trade union in its activity and to affiliate with the unions in other trades employed by the government.

Owing to the protest of the socialists against the use of the military in time of labor trouble the government issued instructions that the greatest care should be taken not to injure workingmen. Nevertheless at a recent strike at Longwy a peaceable laborer who chanced to be standing by was seriously wounded by a lance. While this might not have attracted any attention in America, yet in France with a strong socialist fraction in the chamber of deputies it was a different matter. The minister of war has expressed his regret and has sent a substantial contribution to a fund which was raised for the relief of the injured man's family, but the socialists do not propose to let it drop here and insist that the use of armed troops against strikers shall cease.

NORWAY.

The social democrats of Norway have been carrying on an active campaign for the establishment of a republic. So successful have they been that many of the bourgeois papers are now taking the same attitude. But the socialists have no desire to see an ordinary bourgeois republic and the *Social Demokraten* declares that: "A Republic is now certain, but the question is, what kind of a republic. Some republics are worse than monarchies. Whatever form is adopted must come from the people and be subject to their control."

HUNGARY.

Events have recently taken a strange turn in Hungary. For many years there has been continuous friction between the Hungarian and Austrian elements. This largely took on the form of a quarrel about the use of the Hungarian language. Recently the question came up of a renewal of the *Ausgleich*, as the bond of unity between the two countries is commonly called. The Hungarians came forward with the demand for a further recognition of the Hungarian language. The Austrian Minister of the Interior thinking he saw an opportunity to spread confusion in his opponents' ranks proposed to couple the grant of this with a law providing for universal suffrage. He certainly accomplished his object, but he also conjured up forces of whose existence he evidently never dreamed. The aristocratic Hungarian patriots who had been shouting so loudly for a free Hungary at once drew back in dismay at the proposition of a freedom which should include the working class. The socialists, on the other hand, who had stood somewhat aloof from the language question, now suddenly became most enthusiastic patriots, at least so far as this question of universal suffrage was concerned. From *Politik*, of Prague, we take the following description of the result:

"Throughout the whole country meetings with almost countless attendants are being held. Whereas the socialists have hitherto come only from the Magyars, at the present time they find themselves supported by a great mass of people of all nationalities." Indeed so far has this agitation gone that Hungary is practically in a state of revolution. Old party lines have been wiped out both in Austria and Hungary, and the minister of the interior is so badly frightened at the result of his political trick as to consider the advisability of withdrawing it.

On the 15th of September the Hungarian parliament met only to adjourn again, until the 10th of October. The occasion of the meeting, how-

ever, was utilized for a tremendous demonstration in favor of universal suffrage by the workers of Budapest. We take the following account from the Berlin *Vorwärts*:

"The tremendous movement which is being carried on by the Hungarian working class for the attainment of universal and equal suffrage reached its highest point in the march upon the parliament building which was held to-day. . . . Amidst the ringing sound of the Marseilles the laborers marched toward the parliament building. From all ends and corners of the great city the revolutionary song sounded. Budapest has never before seen such a popular assemblage. All industries were closed, partly because of a fear of the "red terror," partly because of the simple fact that the workers were taking part in the demonstration. All the schools were closed. In the early hours of morning the curious were occupying every street where the procession of laborers was expected. Red placards were fastened upon the walls of the houses, calling upon the workers to take part in the demonstration by marching.

"Lay down your work!" read these placards, "Out upon the streets, workers! Demonstrate for universal suffrage!"

Seven places had been chosen for assembly, and by half past seven these were thronged with laborers ready to begin the march, so timed as to arrive at the opening hour of parliament, half past eight. At eight o'clock the march began. From Constitution Street came the first sounds of the Marseilles. It was the type setters who were singing. Red placards were carried by them bearing the inscription, "Give us the right to have a fatherland." Following them came a long line of women, factory workers, marching, also singing the Marseilles, towards the place of meeting. These wore placards across their breasts with the inscription, "Give us universal suffrage!" . . . On the open space before the parliament building the great assemblage gathered until it was estimated that over 60,000 people were present. The red placards in their hats formed long flaming lines. Over their heads waved the flags and the banners and out of the tumult rose the red placards with the inscriptions. Far back from the main body ran streets black with human beings, unable to reach the meeting ground. After some preliminaries a committee was at last admitted with a petition reading as follows:

"Honorable President! The petition which I, with my comrades, bear, speaks in the name of the unprivileged millions of this country to those who have the right which we desire, and who, because of this privilege constitute the present Hungarian parliament. If you, Mr. President, will look around you, and throw your glance out upon the parliament grounds you will gain a picture of what is taking place throughout the entire country. We are but a few here, many more remain without before the door of parliament, and further out in the land there are yet millions more standing at the door of the constitution. Because of an outgrown election law Hungary is divided into two parts: into the citizens of a first and second degree. Law, which should be a common good of all, uniting all, drawing us all closer together, creates privileges and raises barriers between us. To raise this privilege to a universal right, since all are worthy of it, is our desire. To tear down these barriers is our object. It is our firm belief, and our inmost conviction, that this is not only the desire of the millions of unprivileged inhabitants of this country, but that this is the only possibility and offers the only means by which Hungary may become great, large and strong. For the social, cultural, and political progress we are firmly convinced there is only one way and that is through the whole people, who are to-day surrounded with barriers, and we therefore petition this house of representatives to abolish these barriers and then the stream of the millions will press forward with

irresistible power on the road of progress and cultural development. We know well that we can receive no answer here, but we wish to make it known that the word we raise here is the word of the people and that parliament may respond to it as an announcement of popular will to determine whether it will prepare the way to the abolition of the present condition, a condition antagonistic to progress, unjust and hostile to the people. We have come to the knowledge and we go out from here with that knowledge that to-day will remain famous in the history of Hungary. Even though the people may stand in vain before the door of the constitution, and be driven back without result, we know this, because we know that to-day is only the beginning of the battle that is to set a whole people in motion. We hope, however, that the present day may not only become noteworthy in this manner, but still more, because it will indicate the beginning of victory and the introduction of a new epoch in the history of Hungary in which the people will be given that which to the people belongs, in which the fatherlandless shall be given a fatherland."

After an indefinite and uncommunicative reply from the president the deputation withdrew and the assembled thousands dispersed to take up anew the agitation with great enthusiasm.

JAPAN.

We have just received a letter from Comrade Kotoku enclosing clippings from the English sections of the Japanese papers telling of the anti-peace demonstrations. From these it appears that they were very much more extensive than the capitalist press of this country admitted. The entire police department was demoralized and the police boxes destroyed, several stations kept in state of siege, numerous churches burned, and the imperial residence surrounded and subjected to a long and violent attack. The rage of the mob was also directed toward the street railroad company and a large number of their cars burned. The casualties among the police were reported to amount to 60 while these among the public were at least three hundred.

From Comrade Kotoku's letter we take the following extracts: "The Japanese government is now receiving the natural but dreadful result of patriotism and jingoism, which it has previously aroused. Since the 5th of September the city of Tokyo has been drowned in a sea of fire and blood, many innocent people were killed by the police and at last a state of siege was proclaimed. Eleven newspapers were forced to suspend publication, and our *Chokugen* was seized by the police on the 10th of September and its publication suspended. The director of the Tokyo post office has been invested with the right to confiscate private letters and telegrams and the inspector general of the Metropolitan police has prohibited or dissolved all political meetings." He also states that, "The true cause of this disturbance is much more the discontent of the people against a corrupt bureaucracy, although it was started in the name of anti-peace."

From the last issue of *Chokugen* we learn that Comrade Kotoku has been sick since his release from the imprisonment which he suffered during the war because of his socialism. The same paper states that he intends to make a trip to America shortly in order to recover his health.

GERMANY.

As a part of the reaction against the excessive parliamentarism which has ruled in the German social democracy during the last few years a recent meeting in Berlin is noteworthy. Dr. Friedeberg, one of the prominent members of the Social Democratic party addressed a meeting of the trades unions of Berlin, and offered a resolution which was almost unanimously adopted by those present, criticising the tactics of the Social Democratic party and practically forming a new party which has taken the rather ridiculous name of anarcho-socialist. This new organization, whose members still rise in righteous indignation when the *Vorwaerts* no longer refers to them as comrades, declares for a more liberal use of the general strike, and the placing of less emphasis on political methods. Although the capitalist press have made very much of this first and only break in the ranks of the great socialist party of Germany, yet it is probable that the *Vorwaerts* is right in saying that it will soon fizzle out. It will probably, however, in co-operation with other forces, compel the party to lay more stress on other than parliamentary activity.

BOOK REVIEWS

PARIS AND THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION, by *Alvan Francis Sanborn*. *Small Maynard & Co., Cloth, 404 pp., \$3.00.*

Pictures and text alike are bright, keen flashlights, brilliant in conception, clever in execution, and remarkably shrewd in their insight. The preface is so good that the temptation to quote in full is strong, but it is just a little too long for that purpose. In it the author claims to be a conservative of the conservatives, loving old things better than the new, yet withal loving revolutionists at the same time. When he tells us "What the Anarchist Wants" he lets the anarchist do his own talking in a series of quotations from Jean Grave, Kropotkin and Reclus. In the chapter on "The Oral Propaganda of Anarchy" we learn how meetings are "captured" and a tireless talking campaign is carried on, much like propagandists have always conducted since the world began. But by far the most interesting chapters are those that tell how the anarchists live and play and eat and starve and die. Here we have a series of pen pictures of the Latin Quarter of Paris such as we do not remember ever having met in any work designed especially to depict life in that famous locality. Here we see also how the revolutionary spirit has invaded literature and art, and developed its own music and drama. Of one thing there can be no doubt, —the author has filled himself with the spirit of his subject, he has entered into it, lived it, studied it, until it pours forth from his pen point, with a wealth of illustrations and incidents that makes every page a human document. But when we come to consider the work as a sober contribution to sociological literature (whether the author ever intended it to be so considered or not is hard to tell) we are disappointed. Although the title reads "Paris and the Social Revolution," yet nearly all the real forces which are making for a social revolution in Paris are neglected. It is not these singers, players and *poseurs* of the cafes that will bring about a revolution. They are but the froth on the top of the great revolutionary wave of the proletarian movement which is never mentioned in this book. To be sure these men will fight, or starve or sing or shriek out revolutionary phrases from the top of a cafe table, but if the revolutionary force of France was confined to these the bourgeoisie might rest in peace. But there is a revolutionary movement in France with a million adherents behind it that is threatening the whole plutocratic structure, the Socialist movement. Yet of this he has only a few paragraphs, and these almost disdainful and apologetic. Had he called his book "Anarchy and Anarchists in the Latin Quarter" it would have been more fitting to his text.

SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY, by the Rt. Rev. Wm. Stang, D. D., Bishop of Fall River. Benziger Bros. Cloth, 207 pages.

While the work of Cathrein-Gettelman indicated at least that the author had studied socialism, the same cannot be said for this work. Neither does it in any way reflect the scholarship of the previous work. In fact the present author seems to largely depend upon plain bare-faced lies for argument.

He refers to Rudolph Grossman an "editor of a German socialistic paper in Chicago called the *Fackel*," in spite of the fact that this editor and his paper are perhaps the most notorious anarchists in the United States and bitterly hostile to socialism.

He states, among other things, that, "According to the socialist theory a man has no right to his earnings," that, "according to the United States census of 1900 more than half of the entire net product of manufacturing and mechanical industries was paid out to labor." The fact being that the census shows nothing of the kind whatever, but on the contrary shows that the working man only receives about one-eighth the product.

He turns a large portion of his venom against the public school, and once more the socialists can well afford to be in such good company. He goes through some interesting historical gymnastics in attempting to show that the golden age was just prior to the Protestant Reformation, and that this was all due to the domination of the Catholic church. We have no desire to defend Luther or the Protestant Reformation, but we never heard that either of them was responsible for the invention of the steam engine, the discovery of America or the establishment of the factory system.

To go through this book and point out the errors and falsehoods that abound in it would be a waste of space. For those who want to know the Catholic side we still advise the reading of Cathrein-Gettelman's book, the translator of which, by the way, has been flooding Catholic publications with fervid denunciations of our recent review. Since his attack rests largely on a point which is also repeated in the present work it might be worth a few sentences in reply.

Mr. Gettelman takes objection to our denial of his statement that the German socialists were opposed to legislation for the betterment of the workers, and repeats the story which has long ago been worn out in Germany that the socialists have voted against the reform legislation proposed by the Catholic Center Party. To be sure they have, because that party has generally taken all the life out of any legislation intended for the benefit of the workers. Will Mr. Gettelman please explain where those three million votes came from if the socialist party of Germany is doing nothing for the working class of that country? It would also be interesting if he would explain to his Catholic readers the details of the alliance made between the Catholics and the Lutherans in Germany for the sake of organizing scab unions. Our columns are open to him for this purpose at any time.

FORCES THAT MAKE FOR SOCIALISM IN AMERICA, by John Spargo. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Paper, 32 pages, 10 cents.

We welcome this edition to the literature of international socialism for many reasons. In the first place it is quite different from the conventional propaganda pamphlets. This is not simply that it is better written, with good literary style and logical, systematic arrangement, but that both in title and contained matter it deals with facts in immediate touch with the life of America. It should play a considerable part in the propaganda work, of the socialist party.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

LATEST BOOKS

Issued by the Co-operative Publishing House of Charles H. Kerr & Company

FRANCÉ, R. H. *Germes of Mind in Plants*. Translated by A. M. Simons. Library of Science for the Workers, Vol. 2. Cloth, 50 cents.

"This volume treats of the many voluntary actions of plants that indicate something very much like, if not identical with, intelligence. * * * The author makes science readable and attractive, for the book holds the attention as only fairy stories are supposed to do. The problem of human life is inseparable from the problem of all life, and this fascinating contribution to popular literature will go far toward establishing among the many those scientific principles upon which a rational conception of nature and human relations must be based."—Appeal to Reason.

MEYER, DR. M. WILHELM. *The End of the World*. Translated by Margaret Wagner. Library of Science for the Workers, Vol. 3. Cloth, 50 cents.

Worlds and suns, like men, animals and plants, have their birth, growth, maturity, decline and death. And in each case death means transformation into new life in some other form. Our world like the rest must have an end, and this end will involve the extinction of all human life on its surface. But Dr. Meyer's little book is reassuring in that it shows the chances to be a million to one against the end coming in the time of any who are now living. The latest facts of science, in so far as they touch on the various destructive forces that may in time bring the world to an end, are fully set forth, and illustrated with drawings and photographs. The style is as charming as that of the preceding volumes in the library.

UNTERMANN, ERNEST. *Science and Revolution*. Library of Science for the Workers, Vol. 4. Cloth, 50 cents.

In this work the author traces the development of the evolution theory from the earliest scientific writings that have been preserved down to the present time. He shows that throughout history there have been two

opposing tendencies in the interpretation of the facts of the universe. Ruling classes, living on the labor of others, have constantly supported in some form or other the idea of a supernatural power to be recognized as supreme, while the rebellious workers have slowly been evolving the conception of the universe as one and self-controlled. In his concluding chapter, *Materialist Monism, the Science and Religion of the Proletariat*, he shows more adequately than any previous writer that the philosophy of Socialism is the necessary outcome of modern science.

MARX, ENGELS, LIEBKNECHT. *The Communist Manifesto*, by Marx and Engels, and *No Compromise*, by Liebknecht. Standard Socialist Series, Vol. 11. Cloth, 50 cents.

This replaces our former cloth edition of the *Communist Manifesto*, which was in a shape far less convenient for the library and includes a valuable work by Liebknecht which until now has been obtainable only in pamphlet form. No Socialist library is complete without this volume.

GLADYS, EVELYN. *Thoughts of a Fool*. Extra cloth, \$1.00.

A volume of revolutionary essays attacking the hypocrisies of capitalism in a style that is nothing if not refreshing. The author is not a member of the Socialist Party, and three or four phrases scattered through the book betray misconceptions of the aims of international Socialism. But the main emphasis of the book is on the vital Socialist principle that happiness is the natural and inevitable aim of every intelligent being, and that it is simple stupidity on the part of workers to let themselves be deceived by capitalistic moralizers into acting for the happiness of their masters instead of their own happiness. The book is easy reading, as may be guessed from chapter-headings like "How Smart I Am," "On the Ground Floor," "Shoes, Pigs and Problems," "The Fly and the Donkey," "Boiled Cabbage," etc. The book is beautifully printed and bound, the biggest dollar's worth we have yet been able to offer.

VAIL, CHARLES H. *Modern Socialism*. Cloth, 75 cents; paper, 25 cents. Also by the same author, *Principles of Scientific Socialism*. Paper, 35 cents.

Comrade Vail's books have long been recognized as among the best popular expositions of scientific Socialism in any language. They have until lately been published in the east, but we have purchased the plates and copyrights from the author, and shall hereafter supply them on the same terms as our own publications.

COLE, JOSEPHINE R. *Socialist Songs, Dialogues and Recitations*. Paper, 25 cents.

This book has been issued in response to a long continued demand for something available for use at Socialist entertainments. Most of the selections are suited to the comprehension of children, and some of them would not be bad for Socialist children to recite at the public schools when opportunity offers.

SPARGO, JOHN. *Forces that Make for Socialism in America*. A lecture at Cooper Union, New York City. Paper, 10 cents.

An up-to-date-propaganda book by one of the ablest of our Socialist writers and speakers. Just the thing to sell at meetings. It puts the Socialist argument in a way that will make votes.

CLEARANCE SALE OF SOCIALIST LITERATURE.

We are getting crowded for space, and we are in urgent need of ready money to pay for the new books that are coming out. These low prices are to close out at once a few odd lots of good socialist literature that we shall not keep regularly hereafter.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, unbound. Five volumes of twelve numbers each, 60 cents a volume postpaid. Any volume sold separately. No copies of Vol. 1, No. 3. Only six copies of No. 4. The first five to order a set at \$3.00 will miss but one number; those who are later will miss two numbers. Back numbers, our selection, 2 cents each, postpaid. In ordering say how many you can use of one kind. Specified back numbers 10 cents each.

SOCIALISM AND MODERN SCIENCE, by *Enrico Ferri*, \$1.00. To close out a limited number purchased from an eastern house we will sell them to stockholders while they last at 60 cents postpaid or 50 cents by express, the same as if we published them ourselves.

SOCIALISTISCHE BRIEFE. Blatchford's "Merrie England" translated into German by Victor L. Berger. Cloth, 50 cents; we offer them while they last at 30 cents postpaid. Paper, 25 cents; our price while they last 15 cents postpaid. ..

NATIONAL OWNERSHIP OF RAILWAYS. By *Rev. Charles H. Vail*. Paper, 15 cents; our price while they last 8 cents postpaid, 6 cents by express.

THE INDUSTRIAL EVOLUTION. By *Rev. Charles H. Vail*. Paper, 3 cents; we offer a few copies at 3 cents each or 30 cents a dozen postpaid; 24 cents a dozen by express.

POVERTY. By *Robert Hunter*. Publishers' price 25 cents net, postage 9 cents extra; we offer a few copies while they last at 25 cents postpaid.

MASS AND CLASS. By *W. J. Ghent*. Publishers' price 25 cents net, postage 7 cents extra; we offer a few copies while they last at 25 cents postpaid.

CLEARANCE SALE OF MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS.

We have a considerable stock of books not directly related to socialism, but for the most part well worth reading. They are taking up valuable space in our stock room, and many of them have also been taking up space in our price list. They could be sold to booksellers by cutting the prices, but we prefer to give our stockholders the benefit of the cut prices,

and so we offer them at the following rates to our stockholders or to any one subscribing for a share of stock.

PAPER NOVELS AT FIVE CENTS. By mail six cents extra. *Sister Gratia*, (Satan's Simplicity) by C. Edgar Snow; *Jetta*, a Story of the South, by Semrick; *Dan the Tramp*, by Laura Abbott; the *Auroraphone*, by Cyrus Cole; *Paul St Paul*, a Son of the People., by Ruby Beryl Kyle; *The Co-opolitan*, by Zebina Forbush; *Silas Hood*, by Henry Thornton; *A New Woman*, by Jessie De Foliart Hamblin; *A Story from Pullmantown*, by Nico Bech-Meyer; *The Modern Banker*, by J. Bryan Goode; *Man or Dollar, Which?* by a Newspaper Man.

PAPER NOVELS AT FIFTEEN CENTS. By mail eight cents extra. *Cast Thou the First Stone*, by Frances Marie Norton; *The Garden of Eden*, U. S. A., by W. H. Bishop; *A Daughter of Humanity*, by Edgar M. Smith; *Ahead of the Hounds*, by Lydia Platt Richards.

CLOTH NOVELS AT TEN CENTS. By mail six cents extra. *A Story of Pullmantown*, by Nico Bech-Meyer; *Elsie*, by Alexander Kjelland; *From Over the Border*, by Benj. Smith; *The Last War*, by B. F. Odell.

CLOTH NOVELS AT TWENTY CENTS. By mail ten cents extra. *The Story of a Dream*, by Ethel Maude Colson; *Roberta*, by Blanche Fearing; *On the Road to the Lake*, by Sam Flint; *Ahead of the Hounds*, by Lydia Platt Richards; *A New Woman*, by Jessie DeFoliart Hamblin; *John Auburntop*, Novelist, by A. U. Hancock; *The Last Tenet*, by Hudor Genone; *The Auroraphone*, by Cyrus Cole; *Paul St. Paul a Son of the People*, by Ruby Beryl Kyle; *Washington Brown, Farmer*, by Leroy Armstrong.

MISCELLANEOUS PAPER BOOKS AT FIVE CENTS. Postage six cents extra if sent by mail. *A Breed of Barren Metal*, by J. W. Bennett; *The Impending Crisis*, by Basis Bouroff (copies with soiled covers); *Money Found*, by Thomas E. Hill; *The Morals of Christ*, by Austin Bierbower; *Rome and Washington*, by Elizabeth Morton; *Bond and Industrial Slavery*, by E. A. Twitchell; *Workaday Poems*, by a Worker; *The Pullman Strike*, by Rev. W. H. Carwardine; *Nine Lessons in Photography*, illustrated; *The Thought of God in Hymns and Poems*, by Hosmer and Gannett.

MISCELLANEOUS PAPER BOOKS AT FIFTEEN CENTS. Postage if sent by mail eight cents extra. *History of the Arguments for the Existence of God*, by Dr. Aaron Hahn (covers soiled;); *The Civil War in France*, by Karl Marx; *Our Nation's History and Song*, by Joseph Monroe Clary. This last is a book of nearly 500 pages, containing statistics of all national elections up to 1896, with the full text of the campaign songs from Washington's time down.

MISCELLANEOUS CLOTH BOOKS AT TEN CENTS. By mail six cents extra. *The Legend of Hamlet*, by George P. Hansen; *Money*

Found, by Thomas E. Hill; Theodore Parker, by Samuel Johnson; Launching and Landing (Poems) by Perry Marshall; Evolutionary Politics, by Walter Thomas Mills; An Equitable Exchange System, by Alfred R. Justice; Evolution and Christianity, by J. C. F. Grumbine.

MISCELLANEOUS CLOTH BOOKS AT TWENTY CENTS. By mail ten cents extra. The Morals of Christ, by Austin Bierbower; Suggestion the Secret of Sex, by C. Wilbur Taber; The Thought of God in Hymns and Poems, by Hosmer and Gannett (full morocco); Flowers of the Spirit (Poems) by Ella A. Giles.

THE FINANCES OF THE PUBLISHING HOUSE.

Those who read this department each month will remember that I made an offer, good until the end of 1905, that I would duplicate every contribution made by others for the purpose of clearing off the debt of the publishing house. The amounts received on this offer to the end of September are as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$813.82
Dr. P. E. Gold, Texas50
Frank Kostack, Ohio	5.00
H. P. Bennett, Colorado	10.00
R. A. Bennett, Colorado75
Howard Keehn, Pennsylvania	1.00
R. B. Ringler, Pennsylvania	2.50
R. S. Price, Texas	2.00
"B," Michigan	1.00
Member Commonwealth Club, Illinois.	1.00
Otto Hansen, Illinois.	29.52
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	53.27
Total	\$920.36

As was explained in last month's Review, the most urgent debts are \$400 to a bank, on which we are paying 7 per cent, and \$1,500 to a Wyoming stockholder, on which we are paying 6 per cent. The current receipts from the sale of books will take care of the current expenses, and if the debt just referred to can be raised among the stockholders and friends of the publishing house, it will be possible to use all money received from the sale of stock in publishing new books.

My object in offering to duplicate the contributions of others was to appeal to the few socialists who are so fortunately situated that they can contribute large sums to the cause without undue sacrifices. There are distinct limits to the field in which money can be put into the cause without the danger of doing at least as much harm as good. Large contributions to the party organization tend to encourage extravagance in officials and listlessness in the membership; while to subsidize part of the

propaganda papers increases the burdens of the ones not subsidized, by keeping alive competitors that ought to be out of the way.

Our co-operative publishing house is now made up of 1,148 stockholders, including 227 socialist locals, branches and clubs. I am temporarily holding a few shares which are being sold on monthly payments to single holders, but about nine-tenths of the stock is owned by socialists who have subscribed each for a single share. Thus the control is democratic, and it will be impossible for any man or any small group of men to divert the assets of the company from the purpose of socialist propaganda.

The company is still owing me individually about \$8,000, which is much more than it owes all others combined. I have no other property, and I owe a personal debt of \$1,000 which must be paid in less than a year. I would cheerfully contribute \$7,000 to put the publishing house on a thoroughly substantial basis, provided a like sum is contributed by others.

This is addressed to those who can help more conveniently with money than with personal work. Active party workers can help the publishing house more by sending their money for literature, selling it and turning in the proceeds for more literature than by making a direct contribution. There are, however, several readers of the Review any one of whom could lift the entire debt with far less sacrifice than was made by the farm laborer who was the largest contributor in September. Detailed figures of the company's finances will cheerfully be given to any one who wishes to help if he can be assured that the help will be effective.

Meanwhile most of our readers can help most by finding new subscribers to the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW and new purchasers for our books.

CHARLES H. KERR.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

NOVEMBER, 1905

NO. 5

Socialism and the General Strike in Germany.

As we pointed out in our last number the Congress of the German Social Democracy at Jena was by far the most important ever held in the history of the socialist movement. Affairs in Europe, and indeed all over the world, seem to be approaching a climax. The German socialists had been taunted by the workers in other countries with a caution which almost amounted to cowardice. Even their enemies had begun to mistake quiet determination for weakness and were making preparations to disarm them. All this constituted a condition which required action from the German wing of the International Socialist movement. Bebel's great speech was the answer. It is indeed in many ways an epoch making document, calm, cold reasoning through a large portion of its length, it nevertheless constitutes a warning to the encroaching capitalist class, a rallying cry to the workers of the world. As such it is one of the most important historical documents of the socialist movement. The immediate subject under discussion was the general strike, but in entering into the discussion of this new weapon and the new alignment which it presupposed and the new conditions it was intended to meet he swept over a wide ground. Following is the speech:

"Comrades: We are well nigh unanimous in agreeing that the question now under discussion is not only the most important before this congress, but one of the most important ever before the party. It is a question that has been discussed in meetings, in the press and in our scientific and propaganda literature. Undoubtedly a large portion of the comrades have already taken a position for or against it. Nevertheless it is very necessary, not only that the question should be investigated from all sides, but that we should especially determine how it came about that we were compelled at the present time to give this question a place upon our programme. What has happened that has forced us to take this position? What are the political conditions, especially those hostile to the working class and the

Social Democracy? First of all it is necessary to have a clear idea of what is to be investigated, of what this especial situation requires us to do, and whether our previous methods of fighting are sufficient, or whether we must evolve new methods, and if so what form these shall take.

The *Reichstag* election of 1903 undoubtedly brought about great changes in our political relations. The great vote of our party at this election while undoubtedly causing the greatest rejoicing among our comrades, brought forth the opposing emotions among our opponents. This one fact alone throws a significant light upon certain tendencies that have recently appeared within our party. We have said to ourselves a dozen times, when you are in doubt as to whether your actions are right or wrong, then turn to your enemies, and if they regret, fear and denounce what you are doing then you are on the right way. Accordingly there has arisen within the party all sorts of movements which, as I shall show later, in many cases had not the slightest justification. The attitude of our enemies toward the result of the election is perhaps most characteristically shown in an expression of one of the leaders of the Center, the representative Trimborn in a great meeting held at Cologne. He said: "Think of it, three million Social Democratic votes, what an enormous number! What will be the result if this goes further?" Our opponents have shown since then that this fear expressed by Trimborn concerning the result of the election has struck deep into their bodies and especially into their stomachs. Within our own ranks it was self evident that this success would have an effect. This would express itself not alone in general rejoicing, but it was very characteristic and also very natural (we would have been surprised if it had been any different) that in the most diverse wings in the party, whose existence I by no means deny, and this all the less since diverse tendencies inside the Social Democracy have existed since the very first days in which it began to be a significant force—I say also that it is natural that within these tendencies the question arose as to what the Social Democracy would now do.

In the *Neue Zeit* (and the same thing happened in other papers and in meetings, as for instance in the speech of Volmar) Kautsky raised the question as to whether this tremendous number of votes would not require us to adopt other tactics. You know that this question occupied us at the Dresden congress. It gave rise there to very violent discussions, and even today there is still a little circle in the party who think that such discussions greatly injure the party in outside circles and perhaps even in its internal management. We have indeed seen divisions in our central organ, which continued even until the last month to express regret concerning such discussions, (I do

not desire here to enter into any polemic I am only stating facts) and indeed even in the opposing press a cry was raised about the Dresden congress, as if these gentlemen were sorry that disagreement existed, while in truth they were rejoicing. (That's right.)

Now what has the Dresden congress actually done? In the course of discussion a whole row of divergent points had arisen and the congress has simply taken a clear position on these questions, and by means of an enormous majority once more established the tactics of the party with a clearness that left no doubt as to the position of the party, whether among its friends or among its enemies. That is the great historical work of the Dresden congress, in spite of all the mud slinging which occurred. That was its historical significance. No historian of the party will fail to give due weight to the actions of that congress. At one blow all the host of doubts within and without the party were settled.

I well remember with what words those of our friends were criticised who voted for the Dresden resolution, who had been expected by bourgeois circles to vote against it. It showed that these circles were fundamentally mistaken if they thought that the comrades ever intended to make a fundamental question out of such minor differences of opinion, or that it could ever lead to a division within the party.

Things have now begun to clear up in this direction. To be sure we have seen some signs of disapproval concerning the action of a few of our friends who have been furnished with much advice from bourgeois scholars. Even Prince Bülow changed his tactics from this moment. He now outlines the funeral speech of the Social Democracy. (Laughter.) It appears to me as if Prince Bülow entered upon his office with certain liberal inclinations which he had brought back from his long sojourn abroad. He seemed to believe that he could do something with the Social Democracy if he only handled them with gloves, until perhaps a portion of them would come over to him, after which the party would be broken up. When his hopes and wishes were destroyed by the Dresden Congress he sent up a wail of disapproval. (That's right.)

Even our radicals in Dresden proposed a plan for a commission which should present factory legislation to the *Reichstag* in the hopes that that body would take it up. I warned against these hopes at Dresden and have been justified by what has happened since then in the *Reichstag*. What is it then that has changed the attitude of all bourgeois parties towards our party since 1903? Our votes grew from two million one hundred thousand to a round three million, and our representatives from 51 to 80 then 81, a very significant increase. But our

votes are still only one third of the whole and our representatives make up only one-fifth of the Reichstag. We are still far from a majority. The relative strength in the Reichstag remains as before. As of old the Center is still the decisive party. It still has the power to form two majorities, either an agrarian reactionary one with the Right, or a liberal one with the Left and us.

Only yesterday Bernstein complained about the increased powerlessness of the Reichstag. That is fundamentally false, the opposite is true. I have seen the whole matter develop and I now declare that the power of the Reichstag as a whole, when it once raises its voice, obtains far more consideration, is a far more decisive force than in any earlier period. It was true to speak of the complete powerlessness of the Reichstag, under Prince Bismarck. Indeed even under the rule of Count Caprivi, and even with Prince Hohenlohe it was still true, but since then the Reichstag has gradually conquered a position in opposition to the government. In a great number of questions it leads, and after it has decided the government adjusts itself. It is only unfortunate that those who have control are not our friends, but our opponents. I need only refer to the questions of the tariff policy or of the marine or the navy. Whatever the Reichstag considers essential from the bourgeois standpoint, from the standpoint of the capitalistic economic order, that it secures. It represents its own class interest. Whoever still believes that we, the strongest party in the country, the second strongest in the Reichstag, are about to exercise a corresponding influence on the government is very much deceived, for the party so long as it is not in control cannot exercise any significant influence. If you wish to exercise any influence of this character then you must stick your platform in your pocket, forsake your fundamental positions, occupy yourself with purely practical things, and then we would be very welcome as fellow workers (loud applause) and I tell you that the best of us could then easily become secret councillors (great merriment), or indeed anything else that we wished. "Oh! Paris is worth a meal," and to win the goal of socialism is well worth a few ministerial seats. (Laughter and applause.) Do not deceive yourself on this point. I have expressed myself thus strongly in order to once for all get rid of false views on all these subjects and to show you that for us I do not see everything from so rosy a side. Furthermore, since the Dresden congress the hope of a great liberal party to be composed of the right wing of the Social Democracy, and including the National Liberals has been destroyed. You need only to ask Nauman, Gerlach and Barth what they really think down in their inmost hearts about the German bourgeoisie and German liberalism. If they tell you the truth they must say, "Hopeless, even to despair." (Loud applause.) The Liberal

party whether large or small is today only a creature of imagination. The class antagonisms have in a way sharpened since 1903—sharpened I say not grown milder (loud applause)—and capitalism and its political representative, liberalism, whenever it is confronted with the question of whether, on even wholly unimportant things, it shall go with or against the Social Democracy, always goes against it because of the fear of socialism. (Loud applause). For proof of this we have only to turn to the statement of a capitalist from Saxony in the last campaign. He declared in a meeting, "I am a National Liberal, but I vote Conservative" (laughter). How is that possible? The man said to himself, "If I should vote liberal it might easily happen that the Social Democrats may thereby win another seat and that would be such a horrible thing that I would rather vote for the Conservatives." This is how things stand, therefore it is a fact that at the very beginning of the first session of the Reichstag a regular race for the favor of the workers begun. An enormous mass of social reform schemes were brought in simultaneously,—as many as had been presented in several of the previous sessions put together. The Center especially went into this race because it saw that it must do everything possible to stop the ever increasing mass of workers from deserting its flag. Consequently it presented these schemes, which were wholly displeasing to the inmost souls of the greater portion of its representatives. If there had not been tactical reasons for these schemes a majority of the Center would certainly have been against them. (Loud applause). These schemes increased the attracting power of the city for the country worker and thereby the danger, that the Center would lose more and more of its backward country laborers.

Just a word here concerning the anarcho-socialists. It is necessary to consider for a moment the historical materialism which they have so much abused in order to understand this development. This standpoint enables us to comprehend what is otherwise unintelligible. The Center has been compelled to surrender a whole row of its positions. At the Strassburger Catholic celebration one of the speakers gave a speech so radical that with the exception of a few sentences it might easily have been given by any of us. Still further the Center has been firmly an enemy of science. The Catholics are very scantily represented in the ranks of German intellectuals. The Center has discovered at last that reforms are here necessary in the very head and members of its own ranks in order—not to fight modern science—the Center does not do that, for it well knows that victory would be impossible,—but simply to reconcile and to explain away. So it was that another speaker appeared at this Catholic celebration and said: "Make yourself familiar with science, con-

quer it, make its fruits your servants." Even Haeckel could not have given a more beautiful speech on this point. So it is that we find concessions are also made in this direction. And even if Kolb did but yesterday declare in a most indisputable manner that a situation had arrived in which we sought by means of our schemes to attract the young from the Center, this was simply because he had seen that the Center in spite of its relation to the Catholic church, which for a century has had control of the school and the church and thereby the training of the young, was not able to hold its young followers. (That's right.) This privileged position has enabled it, however, to obtain a very important position in the state.

It is this position also which causes the Center to be looked upon so sympathetically by our evangelical schools of thought, since they see in it a power, which, even if the bayonets should fail might still help the ruling classes. From this point of view also it is necessary for us to win the young to our humanity freeing ideas.

On the other hand, however, there is no doubt that especially since the protective tariff struggle in the Reichstag antagonisms have seemed to be sharpened. Those colleagues who have already been in earlier sessions know that (as is natural during long continued work together) gradually a—I will not say exactly friendly, but still a sort of relation between the different parties arises—and that the antagonism disappears in a certain degree. All this was changed in the great battle over the protective tariff. Up until the vote of 1902 the President of the Reichstag maintained a nonpartisanship which undoubtedly raised him above the rest of us. At a single blow this whole non-partisanship and good naturedness has not only disappeared, but on the contrary, in order to make the robbery as complete and as sudden as possible, it was this very same President, who, up until this time had been the paragon of non-partisanship, who led in breaking the constitution and the destruction of social order. (That's true). Since then the growing antagonism has developed in the most acute manner within the Reichstag. I certainly in no way regret this, but on the contrary consider it very desirable. (That's right). Often enough I have said to Liebknecht, that parliament might easily be compared to a sort of court parlor; as there, so also in parliament, much is glossed over. When it is possible for an observer to say that there are a whole mass of Social Democratic representatives who cannot be distinguished as Social Democrats except by the fact that the word stands after their names, and who make speeches which cannot be distinguished from those of the bourgeois opposition, and yet who seem to be of the opinion that they are the lords of the world, a sort of higher being—when people talk in this style about us I believe I would be false to

myself if I did not retort that it is very desirable that you speak evil of us. If the socialists are really the defenders of principle, the defenders of the old revolutionary tactics of the party, and as such step forward against the representatives of their opponents as they should do, then they have performed a good service for the party. It is indisputable that in spite of all the apparent eagerness for labor legislation, practically nothing has been done aside from the tradesman-like arbitration courts, but my accursed sense of justice compels me to break a lance even for the government. Are you listening carefully Comrade Friedeberg? (laughter). They were compelled in spite of the chaos of social political schemes which they have poured out upon the Reichstag to wait until they could determine for what schemes the Reichstag would decide before they themselves could take a position. The whole political situation made it impossible to act upon this basketful of social legislation. After a short time the Center saw that it was impossible for the Reichstag to do anything with these measures and consequently they transformed their schemes into resolutions. However, much we might oppose this, there was nothing else for us to do but to follow their example in order to guard against a situation where there would be nothing before the house but the resolutions of the Center, while our measures would have been put upon the table. These resolutions are now got rid of and the *Bundesrat* has the whole business before them. It is now up to them to say what they think.

Consequently it still remains true that the inclination to social reform has decreased, and this just because they are seeing that it is going to help us. They say: "If we bring in reasonable laws then the Social Democrats will vote for them and we will get no credit." This has now become very evident to them. Since 1903, however, not only has the antagonism to social reform increased,—the economic antagonisms have also become sharper. So it has come about the most reactionary representative body in the world, the Prussian *Herrenhouse*, that was declared superfluous and useless and an institution injurious to the common good by so moderately liberal a man as Herr von Treitschke, has now become a shield of the bourgeoisie and capitalism. The last session has very plainly shown this. Even in bygone years, this upper house submitted resolutions to the Reichstag against universal suffrage. Then came a resolution against the imperial inheritance tax and then its position toward the new mining law where it sought to force the lower house into a position of antagonism to the laborers, and where Prince Bülow had the greatest trouble in compelling it to give up. Finally came its resolution demanding a new "penitentiary law."* and

*Name applied by the socialists to a law making striking a penal offense.

for which Count Ballestrem and the Catholic members of the upper house voted. The upper house has shown its power in that it compelled Count Bülow to promise to stop making changes in the insurance law, which increased the influence of the laborers. It was at this time that a Liberal manufacturer sent out the letter which the conservative *Reich* published, in which he said: "Thousands of the possessing class thank the Conservative party in both houses for their firm position. It was high time that the government, and their friends the Social Democrats, were given a *quos ego!* (Laughter). What shall we come to? Do people want to chase us out completely, etc." (Laughter). This is the way the world begins to look to the manufacturers. And he continues: "It looks as though it was intended to make the possessing class the slaves of the proletariat."

It is indisputable that the employers' organizations have constantly grown in significance and power since 1903. There are industrial alliances where not one single employer remains outside, while we unfortunately have hundreds of thousands of laborers who belong neither to the free unions nor to the Christians. The class character and class consciousness of the German bourgeoisie is most strikingly superior to that of the German working class. (Loud applause). We must recognize this if we are to know what we are to do. On the one side we have the most complete solidarity while the laborers are divided into various organizations. The Christian unions have been founded only for the purpose of breaking the power of the working class. If any one were to tell a Christian employer that he should belong to a Christian employers' organization he would laugh and say, "What's the matter with you? It is all the same to me whether a man is a Jew, a Christian, a heathen, or a Mohammedan, he is still flesh of my flesh, if he is a capitalist. We employers would be fools if we were to permit such differences to weaken us." (That is true).

It is only the laborers, who, because of the stupidity which has been artificially cultivated among them, divide their forces, although they are just the ones who have the greatest necessity of unity and solidarity. (Bravo).

As a result of this whole situation the pugnacity of the employer has increased. As a consequence we see lockouts in Berlin, in the Rhine province, in Westphalia, Bavaria, Saxony, and Thuringa. The outlook in Bavaria has pleased me, however much I may regret the fate of the laborers affected. In little bourgeois Bavaria the employers now have shouted from the watch towers the fact of the sharpest class antagonisms and class struggle. (That's right). It only helps us, however, when the antagonisms are thus forced to their highest degree, because this brings about a clear situation in which there can be no dodg-

ing nor covering up, nor compromising (loud applause) even the most stupid laborer is forced to recognize the class antagonism when he is locked out, and all those who live through it will be forever lost to the Liberal and the Center. This pugnacity is everywhere noticeable in an increasing degree among the employing classes. The end of the struggle is not in sight. Indeed it must naturally grow ever stronger and stronger because capitalistic development in Germany is moving in a most rapid manner toward its climax. Since 1895 we have lived through a colossal industrial revolution. The laboring class has also gained a new strength thereby, a strength that rests upon their numbers. The power of the bourgeoisie rests upon their money, but numbers will give the laboring class, as soon as they are conscious of their condition such an enormous power that the power of the bourgeoisie, though they had ten thousands of millions in their treasury will be completely overcome. (Bravo.) But all this must be explained to the working class, it must not come to such a condition that within their own ranks their power and importance are underestimated, and as yet the agitation and educational work of the press is largely wrong (that's true). It is necessary to go to the very bottom of things and this congress must clear matters up until at last we all know what we have to do. We must know that we are facing a situation that must necessarily result in a catastrophe, if the power of the working class, because of its numbers, its culture, and its strength does *not become so great as to take away all desire on the part of their opponents for catastrophes.*

It is a great error to say that the socialists are producing a revolution. We have no desire for anything of the sort, and have no interest in bringing about catastrophes in which the laborers must be the first to suffer. You need only turn to Russia to see where catastrophes are necessary. It was no other than Frederick the Great of Prussia who stated in one of his works that, "Catastrophes arise, not because the masses but the rulers make them." This is the same position that von Blüntschi took during his years as a teacher of political philosophy. Even a paper like the Catholic *Echo* wrote in May of this year that it was a completely unhistorical position to claim that revolutions were made by a few scoundrels and demagogues. "Revolutions can only occur when the historical conditions have arisen, and be successful only when evils exist that bear heavily upon the mass of the people. Such revolutions are always successful. Whatever we may have to say against the Social Democracy we can only overcome them by reform and if we do not meet the just demands of the laborers they will finally become socialists." A very intelligent view! Thoroughly correct! Just what we have always said! But it is ever the curse of a ruling class that at

the decisive moment of their own history they never have the right insight and that no one does what he should do.

We socialists find ourselves in the very favorable position, that whatever our opponents do to oppose us we grow continually larger. We must grow because the capitalist society grows and constantly creates the conditions that produce socialists. Just as little as they were able to master us under the "laws of exception," just as little will they be able to master us when some day they make new force laws. Oh! I know that there are many in our ranks who would rejoice if this should happen. (That's true). Then we would show them again what sort of confounded rascals we are! (Loud applause). What did we not show the police power during those twelve years! But it is not alone the economic class antagonisms which are increasing, but the political also.

The ruling class, the bourgeoisie, because of its power has come to look upon its social position as self evident, as something ordained by God (I say that whether you believe in God or not), as representing the state and wielding the power of the state. They consider that they, as Bismarck has said, have the key of legislation in their hand in order to legislate according to their will, that is according to their interest. They say to themselves, "We represent a colossal property interest, and pay the taxes, therefore we must also represent the state." To be sure if this property was produced in the sweat of their face, then they might talk about it, but this property is produced by your sweat, it is from the monstrous surplus which you create for them that they pay the taxes. This humbug, this hocus pocus is continually repeated and the great mass of the people do not yet understand it, else they would all be socialists.

The economic power of the bourgeoisie has increased with giant strides during the last fifteen years and especially during the last decade. You can scarcely have any conception of the amount of property which the syndicates, rings and trusts have brought to the employers during the last ten years. It is necessary only to see how the bourgeoisie of today squanders and wastes the wealth because they no longer know what to do with the money. How they do this can be seen in Berlin, and the scenes there are even worse than those of the days of decay of the Roman Empire, when men fed their guests with the eyes of peacocks. I have been repeatedly told that at the great feasts of Berlin it is nothing uncommon to spend twenty or thirty and even forty thousand marks for a single meal. (Hear. Hear). Those are sums beside which the salary of a Prime Minister is insignificant. So it comes about that the bourgeoisie simply buy the officials by paying them three or four times the salary which they once received, and as a substitute for their right to a

pension supply them with capital, the interest on which is greater than what they would have received as a pension.

Through these officials a great influence can be exercised upon their former colleagues in the service of the government and the ministry. (That's right). So it is that they have legislation completely in their hands. The great masses do not even dream of the influence of capital, which we, however, must cry out through the country, knocking at every door until the people know how hopelessly they have been betrayed and exploited.

I tell you also that the bourgeoisie do not comprehend how such class antagonisms can continue with universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage. Shall the "best of the nation" be turned over to the rough, crude, unthinking mass to have their fate determined by a mere counting of heads? In this "best of the nation" are included not simply the nobility, but first of all, our plutocracy, the aristocracy of money. It is not in vain that a Ballin or a Krupp and a whole row of similar great ones have found a more welcome entrance to the court than many a noble old lord who can look back upon an ancestral tree six or seven hundred years old, older even than the Hohenzollern. This is but another example of the power of the bourgeoisie, the power of money, which has everything in its hands. Here again are proven the words of our great leaders, Marx and Engels, as stated in the Manifesto of 1848: "The government is only a committee to represent the interest of the ruling class." (That's right). That this is the case was shown by the fact that sixteen years ago when I made a similar declaration in the Reichstag the then secretary of the state, Herr von Boetticher supported me with a low "that's right." Naturally I did not forget to announce this quiet testimonial of sympathy of Herr von Boetticher aloud to the whole Reichstag.

An agrarian policy is necessary in Germany—perhaps not so stupid and foolish a one as the present in regard to the raising of the cost of meat—but the government must be agrarian in the interest of the ruling class. Where else can the young bloods of aristocracy find the resources to maintain a suitable, social position if not from the colossal agrarian tax and the other revenues of the state. Since they can no longer compete with the bourgeois and draw out the gold fishes—especially the accursed Jewish ones, who are apt to be the most beautiful gold fish (laughter)—out of the bourgeoisie, in order to regild their old coats of armour; because they themselves no longer care anything for agriculture, and because their sons as cavalry officers are occupied with horses, beautiful women and such pretty things:—because of this we have the hatred of universal suffrage and such statements as appeared a few weeks ago in the *Kreuz-Zeitung*: "Now this unfortunate Reichstag is going to meet again

and as always is incapable of any action and we shall then have the long speeches of the Social Democrats; the Reichstag is now only a necessary evil." It is to be sure untrue that the Reichstag has become incapable of any activity during late years. It was much more true in 1872. *The Kreuz-Zeitung* is also silent concerning the fact that the Prussian "three class parliament" with its "fifteen mark legislature" is permanently incapable, and that there are Prussian representatives who are shameless enough to stay away weeks and months together; as for example, during the last session when the previous head editor of this same paper, H. Wagener never set foot during the entire session in the Landtag until the last day when he went to the treasury to draw his salary for the entire session. (Hear, Hear). A National Liberal representative has himself complained to me about this act of his colleague.

For all these reasons the cry is raised, "Down with universal suffrage." Certainly there was a time when liberalism took it for granted that universal suffrage should be established. The National Union placed this demand at the head of its program, and when Bismarck was compelled by political considerations to overthrow universal direct and secret suffrage in his North German Bund the National Liberal party in 1868 sent forth a call containing the following: "In parliament we see the union of the living, working strength of the nation, and universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage must be made the foundation of public life. We do not fear the dangers which this brings with it, so long as freedom of the press, of assemblage and of coalition remain undisturbed." At that time then the danger to universal suffrage was simply that there were not enough other forms of freedom. The National Liberals at that time also referred to the non-payment of members, because the year before Bismarck had sought to take away salaries. It went on further: "The restricted class suffrage has outlived its usefulness. The next Landtag will show in what manner and under what conditions the transition can be made to universal suffrage." So spoke the National Liberal party officially and proudly in the year 1868, and up until the present time this party has in accordance with its well known Mameluke character continually trampled its own platform under foot, and worked in opposition to all extension of universal suffrage. In 1887 it used its majority with the Conservatives to extend the legislative period from three to five years. During late years pamphlet after pamphlet has been issued against universal suffrage. I would recall also how Count von Zedlitz forced the Bundeserat to oppose the extension of universal suffrage in the south German states, and how in the north they sought to make still worse the most abominable of all electoral systems. I need only refer to the attack on the electoral system in Saxony,

Hamburg, and Lubeck. I would also call attention to the fact that these attacks have been made in just those localities where the socialists are strongest, such as Hamburg and Saxony. Why the party has not taken the action in these localities that many expected from it I shall explain later. I can prove further that it has been the Liberals especially who have been engaged in these attacks upon the suffrage. In their inmost hearts nearly all Liberals are opponents of universal suffrage. The number of bourgeois who are really supporters of universal suffrage can be counted on the fingers. What then have the Liberals done in Prussia to universal suffrage? Rickert has a few times brought in schemes in this direction and as a consequence has been sharply attacked by his friends. In Nürnberg the magistrate is chosen from the majority of the Free-Thinkers party and this free thinking magistrate has misused his power in order to gerrymander the electoral district, so that 15,000 bourgeois have been able to outvote 22,000 Social Democrats. In view of all these events it is a lie to assert that liberalism is a supporter of this most important of all the popular rights.

And how is it with the Center. That Center with which our comrades of Bavaria have made a momentary alliance to secure universal suffrage? This does not in any way contradict the facts that I have set forth. If you believe that the Center has any political principles then undeceive yourself at once. It has absolutely no firm position except to strengthen the power of the church at any price. The Center stands for the "God ordained order." This divine order is always that which is useful to the Center. It is *the* order which supports the power of the church and the Center. Through thousands of years, as I have indisputably shown at Strassberg, this Center has been capable of adjusting itself to all forms of state and all economic stages and I can tell you now comrades that when it comes to the final decision and the Center says to itself, "We can no longer successfully oppose socialism," that I will bet a thousand to one that the preachers of Christian love, who now stand for bourgeois order as they formerly stood for feudal and ancient orders of society will begin to stand for socialism. (Applause and laughter). Then they will show to you with a keenness and a clearness beside of which all of you will be bunglers, that the New Testament in such and such places clearly stands for socialism. (That's right). So will the Center act on the day when it cannot act otherwise. To be sure it will then have to settle with us. Just now the Center has certainly worked to secure universal suffrage in Baden, and Bavaria. Why? In Bavaria the Center is not capable of obtaining power on the basis of the existing suffrage. It seeks a power that will give it absolute domination in the administration and the representative bodies of the state,

and since our comrades in Bavaria are interested in breaking the back of the present electoral system at any price, and since further, liberalism, true to its position as the representative of capitalism, will not yield any concession and opposes every reform, therefore a coalition between the Social Democracy and the Center becomes a necessity. The very moment that the goal of this coalition is obtained, the battle between the Social Democracy and the Center will naturally break out even sharper than it has ever been between the Liberal and the Center. The Center wishes universal suffrage in Bavaria because only in this way can it utilize the votes of its peasants and little bourgeois adherents. Things are much the same in Baden, where the power of national liberalism can be broken only by universal suffrage. Because of this, and not because of any principle the Center stands for universal suffrage in Baden and Bavaria. While in Prussia, since 1875 when Windthorst lived, it has never moved a finger in order to introduce universal suffrage. Indeed the Center has done just the reverse. In the so-called electoral reform of 1892-3 it so reformed things that it even injured itself and was crushed under the abuse bestowed upon it by the advocates of universal suffrage.

And how is it in Württemberg? There the constitution is about to be amended. It has already had universal, direct suffrage for several decades, although to be sure in very unequal and badly divided electoral districts. Now it is proposed to introduce a reform which shall throw out the twenty-four privileged members but the Center would also receive these twenty-four votes through the help of universal suffrage. But the leader of the Center in Württemberg, the Reichstag member, Grober, came forward and declared that this should not happen, for it meant the giving of great additional power to the Social Democracy. That's the tune the Center plays in Württemberg. Then it was that Grober, who is a gigantic and skillful man, painted a picture on the walls of the Chamber on the danger of the introduction of universal suffrage in Württemberg, that made the shivers run over the honorable gentlemen, saying this would enable the Social Democrats to capture twenty-four seats. Oh! if that was only true! But Grober knew as well as I that it was not true—that it could not be true, because the economic conditions in Württemberg did not yet exist.

Grober proposes to be sure, that these twenty-four representatives should be elected by universal suffrage, but in such a manner as to retain his domination in the Chamber. You see how correct I am when I say that the Center always acts in the manner that will best secure its own interest. (Loud applause). Furthermore I would refer to what the Cologne *Volkzeitung* said in April of the present year concerning the attack upon the

rights of suffrage in Hamburg. "It is proper," it wrote, "that every state, whenever it is threatened with a Social Democratic majority in its legislative chamber, which would bring the whole nation to a standstill, should prepare to introduce protective measures."

Now we see the program of the Center. It is for universal suffrage, so long as the present majority is sure, but when universal suffrage will create a Social Democratic majority then it is for something different. We would "bring the machinery of the state to a standstill." No, not at all. On the contrary we would speed it up to a hitherto unheard of speed, while we cleared away the old rubbish (very good). The Cologne *Volkzeitung* continues: "Let the social democrats cherish no illusions on this point." Make a note of that for use in your future suffrage agitations and for your whole political attitude.

There can no longer be any doubt that some day things will develop as I have pictured them here. Marxists and Revisionists have agreed that the proletariat grows ever more and more and must finally constitute the overwhelming majority of our nation. They are the foundation of our nation, they are the foundation of our wealth, the foundation of our well being, the foundation of our capacities for defense, the foundation of all and everything. This great mass forms the foundation of society, and upon its shoulders is built the social pyramid, and whoever attacks this pyramid at its base overthrows the whole. (That's right).

I am not an alarmist. The possibility of leading the development in the most peaceable possible roads depends upon us, depends upon the power that we give our organization, depends upon the political attitude which we can inspire in the German working class, who must learn to know every stage in the historical development of the country,—where they stand, what they are to do, and to leave undone. (Loud applause). In this direction there is clearness! No deceptions, no brake. Ah, seek to brake it as much as you will, the wheels will roll on over you. We see the bourgeois parties coalescing more and more as the antagonisms between them grow less and less. The bourgeois parties say to themselves, "Could we once get this horror out of our eyes, that troubles us day and night and haunts us in our dreams, it would be well worth while to unite." Consequently we see the coalition of our enemies since the election of 1903. A classical illustration of this was the Landtag election of Esslingen, where from the south German popular party, the radical wing of the bourgeois, even to the Conservative, all were of one mind as opposed to the Social Democracy, and where our comrades through their energies were able to turn both bourgeois candidates out of doors. If there was ever a time that I was sat-

ified with our Württemberg comrades it was at the time of the election in Esslingen. (That's right).

There are only the "ins" and the "outs" any more. It is no longer possible to distinguish between them, and out of this situation among the various bourgeois parties has come the imperial union for fighting the Social Democracy, which is to furnish the money to send out a Praetorian band of speakers who without regard to their political position have but the one object—to fight the Social Democracy—which means, to throw mud at them.

How false are the judgments of those who underestimate parliamentary activity was shown in the great miners' strike. The normal result was a victory for the miners and no defeat. (That's true). A victory that compelled the greatest power in Germany, the government, to deal with the miners and to introduce a reform in the mining law. But the government dared not go to a Reichstag elected by universal suffrage, but went instead to the "three class parliament" of Prussia. It knew that they could there carry through a reform that would really be no reform, but only a spoiled egg, (that's right) and in this they were supported by the Center because it desired at any price to prevent the introduction of this subject into the Reichstag. In this we have the most striking testimonial to the moral force which may be exercised by universal suffrage, and especially by the pressure of socialists elected upon the ground of this universal suffrage. The miners were betrayed of their birth right, since a plan would have been presented therein not far from what justice to the laborer demanded. It was there that we grappled with the resolution demanding a new penitentiary law, and there came Bülow's promise to reduce the self government of the insurance organizations. Another proof of what might happen if there were no socialists in the Reichstag! And in the face of such misuse of the miners people dare to demand of us that we renounce parliamentary activity.

Over in Russia a terrible struggle is going on whose primary purpose is the attainment of political rights in order to erect a modern political system! There our comrades with joyous eagerness for battle rush to the barricades while men and women offer up themselves and all that they value highest, their lives even, in order to finally obtain a modern state (loud applause).

Even the conservative General Liebert, a man who would be the last to grant any concessions to socialism, expressed himself as convinced that a war against the proletariat was impossible. Still they tell us that the proletariat has no power and no significance! It is said upon one side and that from which I had never thought such a thing possible that the power of the party has been reduced to a minimum. And that even, although years

ago Caprivi told our Comrade Grillenberger, who is now dead, that the government never presented any proposal until it had discussed what influence it might have upon the socialists. Still they tell us that we have no influence, we play no part! They tell us we have nothing to say although the whole foreign policy is determined with reference to the influence of the Social Democracy. To be sure there is an attempt to make Bülow, as foreign minister, a sort of political Pope, in that every one who attempts to criticise the foreign policy of the government is at once silenced. That happened to Jaures and to our friends in Constance, and even to me lately in Basle. The watchman had listened to a good deal and had begun to get nervous. (Laughter). He did not like what I was saying and when I began to speak on the Morocco question he refused to let me proceed. (Hear, Hear). I did not wish to bring about the dissolution of the meeting, and furthermore the interruption was the best possible thing that could happen, so I have submitted.

Look at the whole foreign situation! The struggle in Russia is causing our government to tremble much more than it admits, (that's right). They have a most terrible fear lest the fire might leap over. They say to themselves that as such a thing is possible in Russia, where there is no organization whatever, and where the proletariat is relatively small in numbers what might not happen in Germany where we have politically educated masses, an organized proletariat and where there are already whole regiments in the army composed of Social Democrats, and where if the reserve and the home guard were called into action they would be almost purely socialists. So they say to themselves, "What would they not do to us?" No, no they would be foolish indeed up there above us if they did not consider these things. This belongs also to the story of the power of Social Democracy.

The present failure in Colonial policy, the blundering foreign policy, all this, and those above, are all aware that this is material for the socialists, material that we alone know how to use. There is no denying the fact that, although we are not a majority, and still on the defensive in politics, we are able to criticise so effectively and so energetically that more than one of those in high places would be very happy if a law could be made preventing socialists from coming into the Reichstag. (Laughter).

This is the situation in which every thoughtful comrade must ask himself, since previously used methods have not been sufficient to make impossible certain attacks upon us: are the tactical and agitating means that we have previously utilized sufficient or must we create new ones?

This brings us to the proposition of the political general

strike (*Massenstreik*).^{*} It will be foolish to attempt to avoid this discussion and to act as if we did not hear it. That is ostrich politics. (That's right). Even if this question is limited on all points as many would desire, nevertheless every thinking man, and especially every leader of the party who deserves this name must ask himself if the time is not here for the party to discuss this proposition. (Loud applause). To be sure the trades union congress of Cologne thought to get rid of the matter by the adoption of Bömelburg's resolution. They rejected the general strike in the sense that the anarchists and the anarcho-socialists desire it, and declare that they did not wish any further discussion. What did that accomplish? The exact opposite. With the adoption of Bömelberg's resolution, which in form and contents was very obscure, the discussion really began to grow in volume. How great this obscurity is, is shown by the fact that even von Elm was accused of not understanding it,—von Elm, with whom to be sure I have often had differences of opinion, and have frequently crossed swords with some violence, but whom naturally I recognize as a very able representative, especially in relation to the proceeding of trades union congresses and concerning the significance of the general strike resolution. The fact is that we must study this resolution with a microscope in order to discover that they have not really gone so far as to forbid the discussion of the general strike. The impression which is naturally gained from a reading of the resolution and from the reasons which are given for it is that the discussion of the general strike should cease. Since it can signify something else, and since we all have occasion to go into this question together with the trades unions, so we must consider the matter from a wholly objective point of view. There was still another place in Elm's article in which he spoke my thoughts. It was where he stated, that it would be far better instead of adopting so obscure and contradictory a resolution to have energetically resolved to declare to the ruling class in unmistakable terms, "If you dare to touch universal suffrage, then the economically organized workers will set their economic power in motion to prevent any such outrage." (That's right.) I believe this position of Elm's is absolutely correct.

The article goes on to say further, that the unions are even more directly interested in universal suffrage than the political party. (That's right.) For when the suffrage is threatened, the right of union, of assemblage and of organization are equally endangered. (That's right.) Elm said further, that the political leaders would be in no way embarrassed even if a law of exception was enacted, since they would simply fall back upon the

^{*}) The German Social Democracy use the word "*Massenstreik*" in distinction from the catastrophic "general strike" idea as advocated by the anarchists, and some socialists, to indicate the strike of a large body of men for social and political purposes.—Trans.

tactics of 1878. (That's right.) That is absolutely true. During this time secret organizations sprang up like mushrooms out of the earth. We played with the police like cats with a mouse. (Laughter.) It was a joke, a source of amusement for countless comrades (loud applause and laughter), and whenever we met together it was our greatest sport to tell the stories of our experiences in leading the police around by the nose, and to describe how we played with them. (Laughter.) And even if a few comrades should go to prison—well most of us have already sat there and it might easily happen that the time would come when, in order to make good we would have to show that we had been in prison. (Laughter.) That would be a pitiful party who could be destroyed by the power of the government and a few criminal laws. (Loud applause.) We are living in the midst of the Russian events and shall we not have the courage to endure a few months in prison, or even something worse in order to maintain the rights that we possess? (Loud applause.)

The Cologne resolution, not only arose out of obscurity and confusion, but the struggle has since then continued with even greater heat. The reason which Comrade Bömelberg gave at that time for placing the question on the program is at least interesting. He declared that it was done in order to avoid the danger of the unions adopting resolutions later which might be misinterpreted in some other place. This some other place is the party congress. They wish therefore to influence our decisions.

Now there is certainly no doubt that if there is any question which interests equally the party and the union it is the question of the political *Massenstreik*. For the union members are not simply unionists, they are also citizens and as such they have the greatest interest in the political condition of the state, and not simply in the economic conditions of society. What is then the state? Whoever wishes to thoroughly inform himself on this question can read the work of Engels on "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," and if he does not understand it when he reads it the first time let him read it two or three times. He will then discover what the state is, and that the state first became necessary when private property took the place of communistic primitive families. As soon as this development appeared class antagonisms arose, and property owners became the enemies of non-owners and *vice versa*. The possessing class constituted itself into the ruling power, which oppressed the masses and transformed the state according to its interests. In the degree that the forms of production developed the state necessarily changed until the feudal state gradually developed. Then came the antagonism between the feudal nobility and the cities, during which, as a smiling bystander, the absolute state developed. This released the modern bourgeoisie, who dur-

ing the great revolutions that overturned Europe, overthrew its united opponents. It is ridiculous to reproach *us* with desiring a revolution, when we remember that all previous revolutions were made by the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie granted numerous rights to the laborers, but the most decisive right, that of suffrage, it withheld as long as possible. As a result of the same logic, according to which all previous oppressed classes have in the course of history seized upon political power in order to transform all society in the interest of their class, just so the proletariat, as the last oppressed class, must conquer political power in order, with the help of this power, to create in the social sphere the institutions which will make its power indestructible. With this, however, the last hour of the state sounds, because within the new society there will be no class antagonisms and the state will have lost its reason for existence. But until things reach this stage—when it will be I do not know,—it may be far away—we must, cost what it will, work for political power; and comrades, it would be contrary to all logic, it would be a spectacle of unheard of character, if as powerful a class as the modern working class has become, materially, physically, and intellectually should permit itself to be deprived of what all previous oppressed classes have demanded as a matter of course. (Loud applause.) We must obtain this; how, will be determined by the political situation, which not we but our opponents create. Then we can tell our opponents, "Take care, during the twentieth century, you shall finally learn from history whither it leads when you attempt to rule against the will of the great majority of the nations. That don't go."

The reproach has been thrown up to us that we have been compelled to accept as a last resort the general strike advocated by the anarchist. Anarchism is fundamentally a necessary outgrowth of the bourgeoisie liberalism and individualism. (That's right.) The classic proof of this is to be found in Stirner's book, "The Individual and his Property" that appeared in 1845 and contained within itself not only anarchy but also anarcho-socialism. (Laughter.) As a consequence we find in anarchy nearly all those ideological views which are to-day advocated by liberalism. Anarchy says: "We have nothing to do with the state: I am myself and nothing else concerns me. The state is a monster, the concentrated power which oppresses me and robs me of my individual freedom. I will not concern myself with it; just develop your individuality as a proletariat, then you will see how far you can go." But the fact is that the most valuable individual peculiarities contained in this magnificent germ of human perfection, in these countless heads, cannot develop to-day and that it is an accident if an individual is able to develop; that present society destroys individuality, and that it is the especial

task of the state to care for this suppression of individuality in the masses. "This state now," says Friedeberg, "we should leave in peace and not trouble ourselves about it." (Friedeberg, "I never said it.") I will prove that to you when I deal with you in Berlin. There we can have the greatest freedom of speech and I shall hope it will be chopped up as nothing has ever been chopped up before. (Great laughter.) So now the general strike is to be the cure all. It will overthrow the bourgeois society—just how the state is to be overthrown we need not break our heads, if the general strike is once declared the state will float in the air,—as if it would permit itself to be floated around in the air. (Laughter and applause.) The general strike will stop war, arm the military, conquer the eight hour day; general strike here and general strike there. And so they rattle on as if they had mill wheels in their heads. The end of the song is necessarily pure and simple unionism; (that's right) not that this is the object but it is the logical consequence. For the followers of this idea gradually become so full of all sorts of beliefs concerning the political powers and the necessity of political action that they naturally come to reject them and refuse to enter into the political organizations.

The general strike question has already occupied a whole list of international congresses. It first came up in 1889 in Paris. There it was that Tressaud-Marseille thought that the demonstration of the first of May would be ineffective unless supported by a general strike; the congress must declare the general strike as the beginning of the social revolution. His motion in support of this was, however, rejected by a great majority at the International congress at Brussels, Domela-Nieuwenhuis moved that the socialists of all countries issue a sort of declaration of war with a call to the people for a universal cessation of work. This motion also was defeated. The international congress of Zurich of 1893 appointed a committee to consider the general—in the sense of the world—strike. This commission submitted the following resolution, which, however, only gave rise to a discussion:

"Whereas, strikes can only be successful under certain definite conditions and with certain definite objects which cannot be determined in advance, and whereas a world strike, because of the diverse economic development of different countries is impracticable and in the moment that it would become practicable would be no longer necessary, and whereas, even in one country the limited universal strike, if peacefully carried out is hopeless, since hunger of the strikers first of all would compel their capitulation, while a violent strike would be mercilessly suppressed by the ruling class.

"Therefore the congress declares that under present social

and political conditions a general strike of individual industries may be successful in the most favorable cases and further that sympathetic strikes (*Massenstreiks*) under certain conditions may be most effective weapons, not only in the economic but also in the political battle, weapons, however, whose application presupposes an effective economic and political organization of the working class. The congress recommends therefore to the socialist parties of all countries that they further this organization with all energy and pass over the question of a world strike for the consideration of the regular order of the day."

This resolution is especially interesting (and I was myself when I studied it, convinced by its contents) in that it rejects the "world-strike" but maintains that the political *Massenstreik* is still worthy of consideration and especially under the conditions, that the corresponding organizations were sufficiently extensive. I find that this portion of the resolution is clearer than that of the Amsterdam resolution. (That's right.)

Again, in London, in 1896, the general strike came before the International Congress. In the resolution concerning the economic policy of the working class, the reporter was Molkenbuhr, we find: "The Congress considers the strike and the boycott necessary means for the attainment of the purposes of the unions, but does not consider that the possibility now exists for an international general strike. The immediate necessity is the economic organization of the laboring masses, because the extension of the strike to whole industries or countries depends upon the extent of the organization."

The International Congress at Paris in 1900 had the general strike as the last matter on its order of business. The chairman, Legien, declared: "We have brought in once more the not entirely satisfactory resolution of London in order to testify that our view concerning the general strike has not changed. . . . So long as strong organizations do not exist the general strike is not even subject to discussion. A general strike of *unorganized* masses would simply be an opportunity for the bourgeoisie. In a few days they would have overthrown the strikers through force of arms and thereby destroyed the work of decades." The Congress finally accepted, by a vote of 27 to 7, the resolution of the majority of the committee which repeated the London resolution.

We see that this question has in no way been neglected. Finally we have the resolution of the Amsterdam Congress.

Between the observations which Robert Schmidt made as representative of the unions at Amsterdam and those of Legien in 1900 at Paris there is a very significant difference. Legien said, "If you Italian and French wish to have a general strike,

then see to it that you build up corresponding organizations and then we will discuss the matter." Robert Schmidt declared, on the contrary, in Amsterdam: "The great German unions do not consider the general strike as debatable." Schmidt in no way refers to the *Massenstreik* in this connection. The position of Brians at Amsterdam in regard to the *Massenstreik* is also very interesting. He held it to be necessary as a defense against the attacks on the suffrage in Germany. The resolution was finally adopted in Amsterdam by a vote of 36 to 4. At our Bremen congress the question was also discussed. Many speakers like Mrs. Zetkin, Liebknecht, Kautsky, and Bernstein spoke in favor of further discussion of this question at other conventions. Finally came the events in Cologne where Bömelberg took the same position as Schmidt and argued against the theoreticians who lacked any practical comprehension of such questions.

Robert Schmidt compared the *Massenstreik* to a string around the neck of the working class, which the bourgeoisie were told to pull. (Shout, "That's right.") Bömelberg referred to the fact that the labor movement demanded peace in order to build up its organization, while the question of the *Massenstreik* would bring unrest into its membership and lead to divisions.

Now the question has been discussed further, especially by Comrade Heine in the September number of the *Monatshefte*. He attacked in the sharpest manner the work of Comrade Mrs. Roland-Holst on the general strike. I would have liked it much better if he had not sharpened his pen quite so often. He attacked Comrade Holst in a manner that I very much regret. (That's right.) He spoke of the high-nosed way in which such men as Jaures talked. He declared that such ideas were worthless political nonsense. If such views are held they had better be expressed only among friends. But in spite of the fact that we may object to the tone of the debate I wish very much that Heine had given a few good examples of his social attitude. I do not myself agree wholly with Comrade Holst. I have, however, read her book with the greatest interest and I can recommend its reading to our comrades. The book was written with the heart's blood of Comrade Holst. She is one of the ablest women that I have ever come to know. When the general strike broke out in Holland, with which I was not wholly in accord, she and her husband went down into their pockets far beyond their ability and have made so great sacrifices that they have very much weakened their social position. She is a tireless agitator and displays tireless energy, sacrifice, and co-operation. For these reasons it gave me double sorrow that she was so treated. (That's right.) Heine also attacks the *Massenstreik* in the sharpest way. I do not recall ever having seen as sharp a criticism or such a bitter fight against any thought as his. His

method of attack consisted in drawing upon his knowledge as a jurist for paragraph after paragraph of the criminal law and piling these up one upon the other to the height of high treason, and the threat of declaring a state of siege, so that any comrade who was not sure of his position might well feel the shivers running up his back, frightened at the great dangers that the application of the *Massenstreik* tactics in Germany might bring. He also referred to the horrible sentences that the courts, especially the military courts would give; because in his opinion it would be impossible to carry out so great and violent a movement in a peaceful manner, especially in view of the provocation of our opponents. When I spoke with my comrades concerning this article one of them said, "Heine, although not so intending, has supplied some government officials with the very best sort of material for a speech." I replied, that no public official was so stupid. They are not quite the most stupid that become public officials. (Heine, "Certainly they are not so stupid as that!—Statdhagen, "Sure, they are the most stupid of all.") (Laughter.) I am convinced, Comrade Statdhagen, that you are much smarter than all the public officials together. (Loud laughter.) No, not even the most stupid public official is as stupid as to make such use of class justice.

But the whole foundation of Heine's deduction is false. I deny emphatically that all the results which Heine foresees would follow from a *Massenstreik*. All the things that he considers as possible and probable in a *Massenstreik* can with equal reason proceed from any great strike. If anyone had asked Heine's official advice prior to the outbreak of the great miners' strike he would have had the same reason to advise against it. Now in reality the miners' strike had not the least reason for such objection. The miners conducted a magnificent *Massenstreik*, which was more significant than have been those of all other countries, and this in a marvelously peaceful manner. I traveled through there from Brussels in coming back from a conference and was astonished at the holiday like peace in the Ruhr region. Not a chimney was smoking, where previously we were compelled to close the car windows against the smoke. The land was like a naked waste. The villages lay as peaceful as if no one dwelt therein. When such a thing is possible among a class of laborers who are politically and culturally as backward as these, then we must well ask ourselves, what we might not do with our far greater means and our far more developed discipline, without any of the results that Heine has foreseen. (Loud applause.)

Finally there comes a point where we dare no longer count the cost. Schiller said, "Worthless is the nation that will not joyfully give its all for its honor." Yes, worthless, pitiable, is

a working class that will permit itself to be used like dogs, rather than dare turn against its oppressors. (Thunderous applause.) There is Russia, there is the June massacre, there is the commune! By the deeds of these martyrs, dare you not go hungry for a few weeks to defend your highest human rights? (Thunderous applause and clapping of hands.) Ah, you know little of the German workers if you cannot expect that of them. (Renewed applause.)

What had Heine to say in Wyden when I moved that the word "legal" should be struck from our platform?* It was carried unanimously without debate. (Heine, "And rightly.") Then we shall do right to-day when we do the same on the next occasion. (That's right, and laughter.) We are not on the offensive; we only defend ourselves. The political *Massenstreik* is not simply a theoretical but a practical question, concerning a method of fighting that must and shall be used on occasion. Heine certainly did not intend to furnish material for the anarcho-socialists (Heine, "No"), but it is inevitable that Friedeberg and his followers would take advantage of such material and cry, "Now you see to what the German Social Democracy has come. Here we have terror material at wholesale. (Friedeberg, "We have got better material than that.") Nowhere does Heine say that we shall not defend ourselves when we are attacked. He only says that these means are useless; but he has no other to suggest. Shall we quietly stand and let ourselves be skinned alive?

They tell us that the *Massenstreik* is a useless weapon, but in 1891 the Belgians used it to obtain universal suffrage, and with relatively more success than the miners' strike, which brought only a botched-up mining law, and which was also a political strike. Our Belgian comrades have captured 33 out of 140 votes in the Chamber. In 1903 they went once more on a strike in order to completely secure universal suffrage. Then to be sure they had no success. I will not here enter upon a discussion of the tactics of the Belgians, but very significant thoughts occur to me. In 1902 the Austrian miners carried through a *Massenstreik*. They were successful, and secured the legal nine hour day, which we do not yet have. Then came the so-called sympathetic strike in Barcelona, a purely anarchistic strike. Indeed with us in Germany neither the unions or the parties ever think of declaring a so-called sympathetic strike. This so-called strike, that in order to secure the demands of a certain portion of the laborers calls out on strike the whole labor-

*During the "laws of exception" the headquarters of the German Social Democrats was at Wyden, Switzerland, and since they could have no legal existence the word "legal" was stricken from the platform.—Trans.

ing class in a great industrial circle is doomed to failure. Then came the Swedish demonstration strike. These also we will not have in Germany. This was the sort of strike in which they say, "We will have a *Massenstreik* of three days." Nevertheless this strike was not without result. Even if the Swedes did not succeed in having the Chamber pass the resolution which they demanded of the government, yet two years later a new election law was submitted. The old law, against which the strike was directed, had become impossible. Even there, where the *Massenstreik* took place under conditions which I would never endorse in Germany, it has had some success. Then came the *Massenstreik* of the Italian workers against the shooting of their comrades. That was a strike which sprang spontaneously from the masses, where 20,000 laborers laid down their work and compelled the government to declare that for the future it would prevent any such shooting of the workers. To be sure this did not prevent a similar massacre in later years. Besides this, however, this strike has caused an increase in our vote at the election which followed shortly after from 165,000 to 316,000, and must therefore have produced a by no means unfavorable impression upon the masses, as a result of this strike, although all the bourgeois parties were aroused to the highest degree and united against us.

Finally, then, came the railroad strike of last spring. I was myself a witness of this in North Italy. It miscarried, and the blame fell mainly upon our members, with I know not what justice. But no one had thought of such a strike. About seven years ago the laborers and officials of the Swiss Northeast Railroad laid down all their work at twelve o'clock in a body so that when the official in one station called to the officer at the next one, "Where is train No. 12?" The answer came, "It's staying here." (Laughter.) This decided the question. They struck for three days. The management was completely destroyed and they attained what they wished, supported, to be sure, by the bourgeoisie.

Finally I recall the *Massenstreik* in Russia. There where our comrades have no political rights and power, strike after strike is carried through, three or four at once in the same place, with an energy that calls forth the greatest astonishment. Meanwhile the conditions in Russia are so abnormal that these strikes can scarcely be offered as an example to us. It is certainly no accident that since the year 1893 these political strikes, these *Massenstreiks* have first begun to be utilized, beginning in Belgium. Then the question rested until 1902 and from then to 1905 there have been a large number of such strikes. It is also by no means true, as has been said, that *Massenstreiks* are

all failures. I question your trades unions, how many strikes did you lose even when you had a strong organization? Countless, and even to-day many are lost. Here we are dealing with wholly insufficient means, with unorganized laborers, incensed to *Massenstreiks*. To be sure, comrades, I do not ask this of you. No one asks it of you. That would be foolish. If we Germans are famous for the fact that we have philosophical heads, if we love, as Heine has rightly said, to become politicians, then we have first to organize the young, as scarcely any other nation. (That's right.) The German military power, however much we may fight it, is a masterpiece of organizing, and that is due to this German, Prussian peculiarity. Even our insurance legislation, however much we may complain of it, is a masterpiece of organization. We Germans do not so easily take a step that we have not carefully examined. The reproach is sometimes thrown to us that we are like the Austrian *Landsturm*, which always comes limping on behind. We are of the opinion that before we enter into a great battle we must first thoroughly organize and agitate until we have created the political and economic understanding, made the masses self conscious, and ready for resistance and inspired them for the moment when we can say to them, "You must throw everything into the scale now because a question of life and death for you, and for all mankind, as fathers and as citizens is now to be decided." We shall not, and my resolution says nothing of the kind, blindly drive the masses into a strike. It should be self evident that we would not permit the unorganized masses to go blindly into the strike. Heine questions, "Will you have them uncontrolled?" That simply shows that you (turning to Heine) have no close knowledge of the feeling of the working class in these things, and this is no reproach for you, for your work does not bring you in connection with them. I say that what is still lacking we must create. (Heine, "That's right.") My resolution provides for this. State that it is as yet not satisfactory, but that it can be made so. If you are all agreed to act in the sense of my resolution and go out from this congress into the country to the comrades in a solid body, acting in the sense of this resolution, and if the party press does its duty in the far higher degree, and if not only the party press, but also the trades union press explains to the masses, and proves to them that they must occupy themselves politically, and points out what is at stake for them as citizens and as trades unionists, and what tremendous significance the suffrage, for example, has, then the conditions for a general strike will be created. But if, like Robert Schmidt, they state in cold blood that the anarcho-socialists will henceforth be clung to by the trades unions—when

one gives himself up to this sort of fatalism, that is the end of the song. They will merely make the trades unions pure and simple unions.

So, for example, Comrade Bringman, in a reference to an expression of Kautsky's in the *Neue Zeit*, of which I also, when I read it, said: That is a dangerous expression, which can be easily misused; so Bringman said in his brochure, "The Fifth Trade Union Congress and the Class Struggle in Germany," in which he quoted Kautsky: "Still less than ever before can the proletariat expect anything from the imperial government. All significance and life have been taken from the Reichstag." From this he draws the following conclusion: "Parliamentarism is simply played out in Germany. The three million victory of our party in 1903 has changed nothing, but has only accelerated this process. I therefore maintain that it was absolutely correct for the fifth trade union congress to not concern itself any further with social political matters. The fact is that we cannot expect any improvement in our economic condition through legislation within any perceptible period. For the immediate future at least our attention must be given exclusively to our unions. We can improve our economic condition only through our organizations and by means of hard economic battles." (Applause.) Then, again, on page 12 of this brochure, we read as follows: "The whole political and economic situation points the German working class to the trade union movement. Under present conditions it is the only means to improve the condition of the working class. The class struggle of the future will be fought out on the economic field. The unions are the bearers of this class struggle." When he thus looks upon political activity as useless, it amounts to nothing that at the close of this speech he gives utterance to this very beautiful expression: If it should become necessary to defend political rights "then we may be sure that these laborers will be firm in their defense of political rights. When such a situation shall present itself, the economically organized laborers will know how to fight bravely, conquer manfully, and, if necessary, to die like heroes." All very pretty, to be sure, but when said in this manner by a man holding an official position in his union, and who also says: We are not in a condition to obtain anything through politics within any conceivable time, then I ask you—we have nothing to do with Bringman's *intention*—will not the unionist say, "Why should we pay our pennies to a political party?" (That's right) and the younger trade unionists will say, "Then I will not unite with the party organization!" This question will lead to a more and more one-sided activity among our trade union leaders, until at last, and wholly unintentionally it ends in anarcho-socialism. Furthermore, I

would call your attention to the fact that while the congress in Cologne was considering the question of the *Massenstreik*, in a conference between the Social Democratic organization and the trades union committee of Hamburg as to what we should do in reference to the attacks upon the suffrage by the Hamburg council, old party comrades and trade unionists said: "You have no idea how bad the situation is with many of the younger trade union leaders in that they sneer at the party, (Hear, hear) and at socialism, (Hear, hear) and the future state. They even deny that we are leading a class struggle." Comrades, I am only quoting what was said there, and those who said it are tried comrades from the trade union committee. I was simply struck dumb when I heard it. It was further confirmed by the editors of the *Echo*. When after this the opinions of Bringman find sympathy in this place even from Legien, then I am forced to say: "To your posts, consider what you are doing; you are traveling along a very dangerous road, which may end in your own downfall, without your being aware of it." (Very true.)

Of course, there can be no talk, such as we often hear, of the general strike coming, instantaneously, over night, with no chance of discussion. Such a great Democratic party as ours can have no secret politics. (Loud applause.) It must fight in broad daylight. (Renewed applause.) How shall we ever be able to direct the masses, if we do not bring them morally and intellectually within our influence, until we shall arouse their enthusiasm and their confidence, until we can say to them—now there is no other way, on to the battle, if you but do your duty victory is certain. (Bravo.)

And now to something else. We do not fight for utopias nor to demand the co-operative commonwealth. We do not believe that the general strike will transform the capitalist society into a body of angels, but we fight for very real rights, which are the essentials of life for the working class if they are to live and breathe politically. When the question of the abolition of universal suffrage comes up, it is certain that even in bourgeois circles, however corrupt they may be, there is still a large proportion of the people who will say: That must not be; a right must not be taken from the workers when they have not misused it, and we will undoubtedly receive a certain sympathy from this source. Furthermore, I have a much stronger position in defending a right that I have possessed for ten years, than as if I was seeking to conquer a new one. (That's right.) When I can say, "You are simply using brute force to take away our rights; you are brutes and tyrants!"—when I can say all this to rouse up and spur on the masses, then ten thousand devils cannot keep us from winning the masses—including even the

Christian workers. (Loud applause.) You are perfectly right, you trade unionists, in fighting the Christian unions, but when in 1899 the "penitentiary bill" was before the Reichstag, and the Christian workers saw how their head was also in the sling, they took almost as clear a position against it as we, and the Center was compelled to yield to a certain degree, as Bachem told us. Do you remember what Bachem said? He did not claim that the Center had become the defender of the right of free coalition because of a principle—not at all—he said, and that was his principal reason, that the Catholic workers were aroused over the attack upon them; and that if this attack was pushed, the Catholic laborers, to the last man, would desert them, and they could not stand that. (Hear, hear!) Just let them try to take the suffrage from us, or to abolish the right of organization! Just as during the miners' strike, the Catholic workers have fought side by side with the free trade unions, so would they range themselves with us when their vital interests as a working class are at stake. Finally, there is always a force of circumstances and conditions stronger than the strongest will. (That's right!)

Furthermore, is it not the greatest, most unheard of scandal that the party which polled by far the largest vote at the *Landtag* elections in Prussia has, because of the miserable disgraceful three-class system of elections, not a single one of the 433 representatives in the Prussian legislature? (Loud applause.) There I agree with Bernstein that we must some day ask ourselves: "Shall this continue? Shall we permanently permit aristocrats, priests and capitalists to stand with their feet upon our necks, in order to destroy the right of municipal suffrage, in order to destroy the right of assemblage and organization?" Recall to mind the coalition law of 1896! Remember the mining law, and the proposal for a new penitentiary law! I do not say that the question will actually come up to-morrow, for a public opinion is necessary, and this opinion must first be created. There will probably be first a few violent attacks to set everything in an uproar. But the question must sooner or later appear upon the program. In this connection we are far behind the bourgeoisie of the fifties; they continuously fought for their rights. But we stand like—no, I will not use the word—but like people, to whom everything is the same. (Very good.) As a consequence blow after blow falls upon our shoulders. That cannot always keep on. (Loud applause.)

While on the one side we have Heine as an opponent of the *Massenstreik*, on the other hand we have the anarcho-socialists, who have left our former position and declare we are on the wrong road. Friedeberg, who has repeatedly spoken in great

detail on this question in Berlin, has printed his first speech, and has honored me with a copy with a very flattering dedication. We can certainly say that whatever we find therein is the sentiment of Friedeberg. On page 3 we read: 'The economic advantages which parliamentarianism is capable of conquering from the class state, could easily be secured by the proletariat through its own efforts within their trade unions, and by the erection of co-operatives of consumption and production. The ideal motive in parliamentarianism, the spreading of socialist thought, the increase of class consciousness, can be much more effectively accomplished through the general strike idea, and much quicker and stronger by the application of the energy, which is to-day expended in parliamentarianism, in direct and immediate instruction and agitation by word and writing among the masses of the people. We are conducting no political battle, and consequently need no political organization. Our battle is an economic and a psychological one. Therefore our weapons must be economic and psychological.'

On page 15, where he criticises the party and its activity it reads as follows: "We must never forget that the state in reality is actually nothing but an abstract word, no more; that the state has a meaning, only so long as there are oppressed, and that the moment the proletarian social order is installed there will be no more oppressed, and it will therefore cease to exist. The idea of state and political power necessarily presuppose a condition of rulers and ruled, consequently it is not our object to conquer political power, but to so formulate the economic order and the industrial life of the proletariat that exploitation and slavery shall cease."

A bourgeois ideologist might use almost exactly the same words in demanding that the inner life of the proletariat be raised until they be religiously freed. (That's right.) Friedeberg thinks further that the party is in a position to prevent attack and continues: "And I can tell you that, when the attacks which are to-day being made against the right of suffrage are carried through the German proletariat will be made completely helpless." That will simply give the proletariat courage to fight. (Very true, and laughter.) "We shall shed no tears over universal, equal and secret suffrage" (loud, "Hear, hear"). "On the contrary, we cannot but marvel at the stupidity and poor tactics in our opponents in that they have at last opened the eyes of the German working class to the way that the German proletarian must go;" and on page 19: "Ninety-nine per cent of all things with which parliament is occupied are of absolutely no interest to us and will disappear the moment that the proletariat overthrows class rule."

In complete contradiction with this position, however, he complains on page 10 of class justice. Certainly, class justice does exist. To denounce it, however, we must be in the Reichstag; in our meetings the public officials stop us, (That's right.)

Once universal suffrage is gone then the right of organization and assemblage is also gone, the right of coalition is gone, all rights that we need are gone. When once our enemies have taken away universal suffrage they would be the greatest fools if they left us any other political rights, however small they might be. (Very true.) A battle will be begun to rob us of all our rights, in which we are certain to be defeated! It is self evident that in our unions, in our meetings, in the press, we would continue to fight to arouse the masses and thereby make our opponents uncomfortable. Once they have taken away the principal right, then they must take away the other rights. (That's right.) One depends upon the other. Do you think that a ruling class, who had taken away all rights of the working class would permit a strike of the working class for the purpose of overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie? How such thoughts, such confusion, such contradictions could get together in the head of an intelligent man, and that one of the clearest and most capable men that I know, is something that is impossible for me to comprehend. In Berlin Friedeberg spoke—it must be read in order to be believed—of a fifth estate. (Shout, "I never said it.") That is certainly of such colossal foolishness that it is almost impossible of belief. He said that, it is questionable if the party still stood upon the base of the class struggle. Marx and Engels had through their dogmatic teachings deadened the whole movement. When I read that I asked myself whether Friedeberg had forgotten the whole literature of the socialist party, and whether he had read the "Communist Manifesto." At the head of the Communist Manifesto is the sentence: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." That was the discovery of Marx and Engels, the discovery that signified a complete transformation of all historical cosmology. In another place in the Manifesto we read: "Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie is distinguished by the fact that the class antagonisms have been simplified and that the whole society becomes divided into two great hostile camps, into two great classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat." It goes on to show how the class state arose: "The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie." Then comes the proof of how the bourgeois continually creates greater and greater numbers of the proletariat and compels them to organize as a separate class, but, "This organization of the proletarians into a class and con-

sequently into a political party is continually being upset again by the competition among the workers themselves."

In short, it is only necessary to read the "Communist Manifesto!" It staggers one's intelligence to hear it said that we are not standing on the base of the class struggle. (Very true.) Even our platform, which still holds good and whose sentences in this connection have never been attacked definitely expresses our character as a class party. (The speaker then read from the Erfurter Platform, concluding with the words: "The battle of the laboring class against capitalist exploitation is necessarily a political battle. The working class cannot continue their economic battle and develop their economic organizations without political rights. They cannot bring about the transition of the means of production into the possession of society without coming into possession of the political power. To transform this battle of the working class into a conscious and united movement, and to point out its natural and necessary goal, is the task of the Social Democratic party.") How any one in view of this expression in the fundamental writing of our leaders, and in view of our platform, and in view of a whole list of statements, writings, and periodical articles, can still tell the masses that the party has ever forsaken the base of the class struggle—that is impossible to understand. Friedeberg referred to Liebknecht; but we must know that in the later editions of his writings concerning the political conditions of the Social Democracy that Liebknecht declared in plain words that the views therein contained were applicable only to the north German union. He had changed his position since the foundation of the German Empire. The question might be raised as to whether that was proper and logical, but after Liebknecht had in this plain manner rejected his old views and published the writings only as a document from an earlier period it is in the highest degree unjust, not to say disloyal, to claim to be supported by the authority of our old comrade, and go before the workers and say: "See, Liebknecht agrees with me." (Loud applause.) This whole method of fighting is absolutely monstrous. It is still more incomprehensible to me that in the principal city of the German Empire, the city of intelligence, three thousand workers, among them old comrades, could accept with shouts of applause such a hash of bald contradictions. (Very true.) If I were ever tempted to swear that we had lost our brains and that our political culture was disappearing it was on the day that I read that. (That's true.) But everything has its explanations. I am an old boy who has lived through forty years of party life and I know a few things. We had a similar experience under the laws of exception when a row broke out in a certain place and

one or another of the comrades failed to agree. In Berlin we had the localists who were mad because we made no progress. They could naturally not overthrow the Centralists, and so they were angry at the unions, angry at the party officials who should have taken them across their knees and spanked them. So long as old Kessler lived, who in spite of all his failings was still a strong Social Democrat, he was able to hold them within bounds. But old Kessler is dead, leadership has disappeared, and now Friedeberg comes and raises an opposition against the party and the unions, and at once the cry is raised, "Friedeberg is our man!" (Great laughter.)

So much for the psychology. But to be sure there are comrades who said, "Hold on, that smells too much like anarchism; they sit down together and talk very wisely and give you resolutions with interpretations, which it is self evident that no one else in the world can read out of it, but the condition may possibly develop further." I have often stated that the subject had no great significance. We have had plenty of such instances. We had an outbreak of anarchy once in St. Gallen, then came the *Volkstribune* with its battle against the Reichstag members. Then the *Jungen* were born (laughter) and Robert Schmidt became so famous in speaking about them that now he seems to have joined them himself (great laughter). He is once more back in the sheep-fold. I mean that only in the biblical sense, since in Heaven there is more rejoicing over one repentant sinner than one hundred righteous ones. (Continued laughter.)

The movement of the *Jungen* soon broke up, and I believe that anarcho-socialism will do the same thing.

My further reply to Friedeberg will be postponed, and I will only make a few remarks concerning the 99 per cent. of the questions discussed in the Reichstag that are of no interest to the workers! So the freedom of union and assemblage, class justice, education, punishment, condition of the prisons, taxation, navy and military questions, colonial policy, tariff and commercial policy, abuses against the workers, world politics, labor legislation, workingmen's insurance, freedom of industry, freedom of migration, right of co-operation, public health, in view of all these questions and many others comrades still comment, "Humph! 99 per cent of all the questions discussed in the Reichstag have no interest to the proletariat."

Certainly when such things can be said and be applauded by our comrades then it is time that we went to our posts and question whether we were not in some way to blame. (That's right). During the last few years we have discussed all possible things theoretically, and the final result has not been a clearing up but ever greater confusion. (Loud applause). Seeds have

grown up in this ground that we must now pull out. Such a complete confusion concerning fundamental principles has never existed in the party as it exists today. If this was only true of comrades who had just come into the party, then I would not wonder. But it is partly old comrades who have taken to this way of thinking, and so contribute to the corruption which has arisen in regard to the fundamental principles of the party. It necessarily follows that it is our task from now on to work more energetically than ever before to educate the comrades. I was criticised yesterday for my position with regard to neutrality and I hope that Robert Schmidt will give different references to the places to which I refer in my pamphlet. I have never stood for a neutrality of the trades union in political questions, but only said that a union should not be considered as an appendage to the political party, because it is necessary that they should include all laborers and not make adherence depend upon political belief. The trades union papers and speakers all have the same duty to continually repeat to their members: "You are laborers and as such, citizens, and as citizens you are interested in all great questions of state and of legislation."

When such an educational work is carried on among the workers then I will guarantee to edit a trades union paper a whole year without using the word "Social Democracy," and yet the readers will become socialists. (Loud applause and laughter). That is one of the riddles and that is a form of agitation that must be carried on. When along with this the party press devotes itself much more than previously to party organizations, when most of all the work of organization is undertaken in the sense of my resolution, then it will be no great task to double the membership of our unions in the course of a year, until the union shall rise to at least 25 per cent and the readers of our organs to 50 or 100 per cent of the workers. Thereby we will obtain a mass of means for the education of the party-members, and a preparation for the magnificent battles that are to come, such as we had never dared to dream of.

In this sense I ask you to vote for the resolution; in this sense we shall battle until the victory is ours fully and completely. (Stormy and long continued applause).

Translated by A. M. Simons.

AUGUST BEBEL.

The resolution, in support of which Bebel made his speech, printed herewith, and which was adopted by a vote of 288 to 14, reads as follows:

"Because of the efforts of the ruling classes and powers to deprive the working class of a legitimate influence on the public order and the things of common concern, or to rob them of this in so far as it is obtained through representatives in parliamentary representative bodies and thereby to deprive the working class of all political and economic rights, the congress feels itself called upon to declare that it is the im-

perative duty of the whole working class to resist all attacks upon their manhood and their rights of citizenship with all the powers at their disposal and to continuously demand complete equality of rights.

"Experience has especially taught us that the ruling parties, including even the extreme bourgeoisie left, are opponents of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage and that they attack the same or seek to abolish it or to restrict even the existing backward forms whenever their domination is threatened.

"As a consequence we note their opposition to any extension of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage in the separate states (Prussia, etc.) and even a reduction of the existing outgrown electoral law from fear of even the very small influence of the working class in parliamentary representative bodies.

"Examples of this are to be found in the robbery of the suffrage by a dominating and cowardly bourgeoisie and an ignorant little capitalist class in Saxony and in the so-called Republic of Hamburg and Lübek, and the attacks upon the municipal suffrage in the various German states of Baden and Saxony, and in such places as Kiel, Dresden, Furth, Chemnitz, etc., by the representatives of the various bourgeois parties.

"In consideration of the fact that universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage is the special pre-requisite to a normal political evolution of society, just as the freedom of coalition is the essential of the economic elevation of the working class:

"And in further consideration that the working class, through their ever increasing numbers and intelligence and their labor for the economic and social life of the whole people, as well as by the material and physical sacrifice which they bear for the military defenses of the country, constitute the principal factor in modern society, they must demand not only the maintenance, but also the extension of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage for all representative bodies in the sense of the Social Democratic platform, and the guarantee of complete freedom of coalition.

"Therefore the Congress declares that it is especially the duty of the whole working class in case of any attack upon universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage, or the right of coalition, to utilize every apparently valuable means in defense.

"As one of the effective methods of fighting in averting any such political outrage upon the working class, or in order to conquer such an essential basis for its liberation the party considers under certain conditions the comprehensive utilization of the stoppage of work by the masses.

"The application of this method of battle is only possible with a great extension of the political and economic organization of the working class, and the continuous education of the masses by the labor press and the oral and written agitations.

"This agitation must set forth the importance and necessity of the political rights of working class and especially the right of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage and the unrestricted right of coalition, with regard to the class character of the state and society and the daily misuse which the ruling classes and powers perpetrate upon the working class by means of their exclusive possession of political power.

"Every party member is in duty bound whenever an economic organization of his trade is in existence or can be formed to enter into it and to support the aims and purposes of the unions. But every class-conscious member of a union has also the duty of uniting with the political organization of his class—the Social Democracy—and to work for the extension of the Social Democratic Press.

"The conference urges the Central Committee of the party to prepare a pamphlet founded upon the above resolution and its demands and to arrange for its distribution throughout the whole German working class."

The Historical Development of the American Proletarian.

THE POLITICAL POSITION OF THE WORKER.

I N the following section I shall attempt to explain the peculiar conditions under which the American Proletariat lives and which give rise to the fact that there is "no socialism in the United States."

In the first place, however, I must mention some considerations which one ordinarily meets in the discussion of these facts. For instance, the opinion is often expressed that the absence of socialism in America is not because of any peculiarity in American life but is rather explained by the peculiar attitude of the Anglo-Saxon race, from which the American proletariat is descended. From its very nature, however this idea is impossible of consideration by those who proceed from the socialist standpoint. This reasoning is two-fold false: In the first place the "Anglo-Saxon" race is by no means naturally unreceptive of socialist ideas, as is shown by the strongly socialistically colored chartist movement of England of the thirties and forties, the development of the Australian colonies, and even of the mother country in recent years. In the second place the North American proletariat is by no means exclusively nor even mainly composed of members of the Anglo-Saxon race.

* * *

There are millions of people in America who have immigrated during the last generation in whom socialism has been bred in the blood. The Germans alone, together with descendants of German parents, amounted to 3,295,350 in 1900, of whom 1,142,131 were engaged in industry, mostly as wage workers. Why are not these millions socialists, even if we are willing to accept that the Anglo-Saxon is immune against the socialist bacilli?

II.

In modern states as the public life becomes more and more complicated and the democratization of institutions becomes more extensive it is ever more difficult to present political ideas apart from party organizations. For no other community does this hold so closely as for the United States. It is as yet the only great nation in which actual democratic institutions find a still further complication by their relation to a federal organization.

In this great nation, twenty times as large as the German Empire, actual democratic institutions prevail, as the following shows: universal suffrage exists as a rule in every state in the union (present restrictions are unimportant); by this, universal suffrage is chosen, however, not as in the European states (with the exception of Switzerland) only a law-making body, but also—and this is the main point—nearly all the higher administrative officers and judges. Most important of all, the higher officials of the states—the governors—are elected for terms of from two to four years.

* * *

Taken in connection with the numerous city and county elections the electors of some cities in such a state as Ohio are required to choose twenty-two different officials on an average each year.

* * *

These demands on the capacity for action of the ordinary citizen need only to be stated to make evident the impossibility of their fulfilment. Consider, for instance, that a considerable number of the elections take place simultaneously over a large territory—the majority of the American states are larger than Bavaria, Baden, and Wurttemberg together, some exceed the extent of the Prussian kingdom and indeed the whole German Empire—remember also that if there is not to be complete confusion there must be some sort of an understanding between the citizens of a city, a county or a state (and in presidential elections of the whole union) concerning the candidates who are nominated, and that votes must be gathered for the candidates. When these things are considered it does not need an argument to show that it is impossible to leave these things to the voters directly, and that as a result there must be many people who make it their life business to occupy themselves continuously with the problems of election, either in selecting the proper candidates, in arranging the various tickets, or in securing the election of the nominated candidates.

In the beginning, while the number of voters, as well as the number of officials was still small (up until about the year 1824) the American democracy directed the mass of the voters through the legislative bodies. These formed committees of their members, such, for example, as the legislative caucus of congress, who nominated the candidates to be elected by the people.

When at the beginning of the third decade of the 19th century the flood of democracy came, these functions (the guidance of the mass of voters) were "democratized," that is, they were handed down to be operated from beneath. There were in the

beginning a few demagogues in the rapidly growing city of New York, with its many colored diverse population, who began to grasp the election machinery. Aaron Burr was one of the best known of these who with the help of a swarm of followers organized a notorious guild of professional politicians, in whose hands the "business of politics" in the United States has remained since that time, and whose domination over the mass became the firmer as the election machinery became more complicated and the decent portion of the population withdrew itself more and more from participation in politics.

* * *

If these gigantic machines are to operate effectively they must have a great organized body of skilled professional politicians at work. There must be a staff of trained workers in every district at the disposal of the professional wire pullers, who in turn are kept in order by the heads of the machine, and just as the mass of men grows, so must the financial resources which makes possible the perfect operation of machinery. . . . This has now reached a point where in the last presidential election the total campaign expenses of each party were estimated to be over five millions of dollars. These are the tasks that a party must accomplish which wishes to fight for its "ideas" in America. It must be evident to any one what difficulties such a situation constitutes to the foundation and building up of a labor party such as the Social Democratic. This would be true even if we were dealing with the beginning of the political life. But the fact is that the political machines have for years been in the hands of shrewd leaders. This doubles the difficulties before a new party, in that it has to enter into the battle against old parties who are already in possession. Some of the especial obstacles to the development of an independent socialist party organization which arise from this condition deserve closer consideration.

III.

From the very beginning of the Republic two great parties of almost equal strength have, with occasional change of names, dominated the public life of the United States. I wish to deal first with the reasons which have given rise to the monopolistic position of these two ruling parties and also the sources of their drawing power.

In the very beginning it is necessary to consider the sources of the financial means by which these gigantic political machines are kept in operation. The money with which the parties in America work springs from three different sources.

1. Free will contributions of rich party members and general public subscriptions as is the case with us in Germany.

There is this difference that in America capital, because it sees direct results ahead of it, is much more inclined to give great sums to the support of the party, of which in turn they are able to make great demands. From the very nature of party organization in the United States, sometimes one and sometimes the other of the great parties receive support from one and the same capitalist power. The great trusts finance first of all the general party organization, but the Standard Oil Company and similar great corporations will give money in New York to the Democratic Party, in Pennsylvania to the Republican,—always to the one which happens to be dominant, or which has the best prospect of immediate victory.

2. The assessment of party officials supplies the party organization with a great source of financial income.

3. The taxation of the candidates for the various offices often brings in rich returns. It is the custom for every one who seeks a nomination to make a "contribution" to the party. This contribution is generally of considerable size. It ordinarily amounts to at least a full year's salary, and more in the case of many offices. Indeed in many cases it is higher than the whole regular income which the official receives during his term of office.....

The election purposes for which this money is used are, in the first place, for the pure and simple purchase of votes. A large portion of the negro vote, as well as that of many uneducated immigrants and of the slum proletariat of the great cities is notoriously purchasable and is notoriously purchased. The great mass of the electorate of the poorest portion of the population is naturally not to be secured in such an easy fashion, but throughout broad strata of the poorer population the party leaders know very well how to gain favor by the distribution of gifts to the needy in time of necessity and trouble. Here a dollar is lent, there a railroad pass secured, another receives fuel on some cold morning or a turkey on Christmas day; medicine is bought for the sick, or a coffin secured for the dead. Along with all this goes generous distribution of liquor in the saloons, where perhaps the most important portion of the whole political activity is carried on..... Or the case is approached from the other side: the party holds the threat of punishment over an obstinate voter and thereby brings him back, or at least frightens others. It has him discharged if he is in any way connected with the municipal government, or if he is an employer the factory inspector gets after him. The assessor looks much closer at the books to see that full taxes are paid. The saloon keeper who has not kept the exact hours of the police regulations finds himself arrested, etc.

The foregoing considerations enable us to complete the circle in which party existence in America moves. Because the great parties have the money with which they can directly or indirectly buy votes, with which they can pay the great staff of workers and the whole apparatus of the political machine with which the electorate can be influenced, and because they utilize all methods to benefit their followers, and to injure their opponents, therefore they have this great throng of followers, therefore they possess the great attractive power, therefore they have the political monopoly whether this be domination or good prospect of gaining victory the next time. And *because* they occupy this position, because they are in possession of the *power*, therefore they have the means at their disposal to bless and to damn, therefore they are able to obtain the necessary financial contributions to keep the political machine in motion.

This circle, so fateful to all who stand outside of it, has still more significant appearances in other connections.

In the first place the dominant party has a tremendous advantage in the offices it is about to offer to its followers.

The significance of this close connection between political parties and distribution of offices can not be too highly estimated in considering the development of American party conditions. It deserves especial consideration when examining the conditions which make possible the development of a socialist movement. It is just this movement which suffers most under the dominant system. It is easy for a laborer to be a socialist when he knows that even though he be in a governmental position he can still express his social democratic inclinations without any great probability of losing his position.

In America the condition is wholly different: here the way to the higher offices leads always beneath the yoke of party adherence and all who desire a position in the state or municipal services must support the party, not simply on election day, but for a long time previous, as an active party worker. This places a hard test on "loyalty" which the majority cannot meet. This is especially true with the labor leaders of the great trades unions since a still richer reward beckons to them if they will but swear allegiance to the dominant parties. They may receive anything from a well paid office of factory inspector up to secretary of state, according to the influence that they have been able to wield. It is a well recognized fact that the ruling parties have for years had great success in rendering influential labor leaders "harmless" through the bestowal of political positions. It would be easy to give a long list of instances of this emasculating process. At the present moment it is stated that the President of the American Federation of Labor (a man occupying the same

position as Legien in Germany) is to be the successor of Carrol D. Wright as director of the department of Commerce and Labor, while John Mitchell the leader of the miners, has been offered a position in the administration at Washington.

It has been asserted that within the last few years that thirteen such leaders in Massachusetts and thirty in Chicago have been placed in official positions.

It is not so easy to be a socialist and to demand "the overthrow of the existing social order," when the picture of such a fat plum is continuously hung before the eyes. Few therefore have the independence to point out to their followers the hopelessness of the ruling policy and the necessity of a socialist movement in the evening, if during the afternoon a boss of one of the great parties has been offered the candidacy for a lucrative electoral position or a "fat share of the spoils" at the next electoral victory. When, however, the influential leaders are secured and their strength and influence among their comrades thereby lost to an independent labor movement, this does not mean simply a direct gain for the great parties so far as the personality of the leaders and the little circle of the laboring class in which they have been trusted but in a much more significant manner an indirect strengthening of the existing order in that this bait of office has caught the possible leaders of an oppositional independent labor party, which has thereby suffered a painful loss. In other words the great parties kidnap the officials who would assist in the formation of a socialist party organization.

But it is not alone personal motives which hold the great mass to the old parties. Along with these there are certain ideal motives which must be considered.

In the first place there is the universal political interest in the form of the public life which in America often leads the individual to unite to the "great party" just *because* it is the "great party." That is, just because he can expect assistance from it for some pet reform of his by which he hopes to abolish some oppressive condition. In order to understand this it is necessary to explain the fundamental difference which exists between the institutions of European states (always with the exception of Switzerland) and those of the North American Union. In European nations the course of political life can best be influenced through the long roundabout way of parliamentary machinery. Representatives are elected to parliament with the hope that they will sometime become a majority who can overturn a government, certainly a very slow and by no means radical proceeding.

While this transformation process is being fulfilled, beautiful speeches are made in parliament, in order to give expression

to the principles of the party, and these beautiful speeches have a significance almost in direct inverse ratio to their actual influence upon the governmental machinery..... So it has come about that the German Reichstag, whose conclusions are almost irrelevant, so far as the general course of public life in Germany is concerned, has become the most favored spot for minority parties in the world.

While this transformation process is being fulfilled, beautiful speeches are made in parliament, in order to give expression to the principles of the party, and these beautiful speeches have parties with fine orators. Everyone knows that what Stadthagen says might just as well be left unsaid so far as having the slightest effect upon any important political measure, but the Social Democratic voter rejoices when he reads these blood thrilling speeches in his leaflets and says with a satisfied smile, "Didn't he give it to them though." It is just this lack of "political sense," that is, of the sense of direct influence and conquest of power, which leads to this form of expression. If we wish to express it politely we call it "idealism" and naturally it is most highly developed in the land of "*Dichter und Denker*." Because of this we are born minority politicians.

Exactly the opposite conditions prevail in the United States. Here the purely democratic institutions are close to the masses, and they make possible direct results. Because not only the representatives in parliament, but even judges and administrative officials are chosen by popular election, interest has been transferred from the legislative body to the administrative office. For reasons already considered, the legislative bodies, especially the House of Representatives, play largely insignificant roles in comparison with the parliaments of West European nations including even such an unimportant one as the German Reichstag. Accordingly there is great interest in the administrative elections. This is just because much quicker results can be secured. To remove a disliked governor or judge is much more satisfactory to the Americans, in proportion to the trouble necessary, than the sending of a fine speaker to Washington. As a matter of fact it does have greater immediate effect and it would have in Germany. Consider for example what would have been the result if the laborers of Berlin, during the time of the "laws of exception" could have turned Tessenborn out of his official position.

* * *

The American laborer can do these things, to be sure at a price that may well seem too high, since he must give his adherence to the great parties just because they are great. For

it is only with their assistance that such a successful influence can be exercised upon the electoral result.

A striking example of what could be done in such a case was offered by the events of the last elections in the state of Colorado. In the election of 1902 the socialist candidate received a very respectable vote. Then came the great strike of 1903 which took on almost the form of a civil war. According to German ideas it would seem certain that the socialist vote would have received an enormous increase. But what was the actual result? The socialist candidate in 1904 only received half the vote of two years before. The explanation of this result is very simple when we remember the political conditions in the United States. The previous socialist vote had gone over into the camp of the democratic party in order to assist it in its fight against the hated Gov. Peabody. And behold, it was not without success. The Republican governor was not re-elected, but was supplanted by a democrat. Even if the actual conditions are not changed under the government of the new man, still the sentiment of revenge is satisfied and the hated enemy has received a blow. And this always does one good. At least more than a song of Ludwig Thoma.

Along with these rational practical considerations there go many indifferent sentiments, which unite the American to the great parties.

In my introductory chapter I have referred to the high degree in which the sense of measurable statistical greatness is developed in the American, and especially to the over-valuation of "success." Now such an attitude predestinates "majority" politics. It is an unbearable feeling for an American to belong to a party that always and forever comes out of the election with small figures, and which can apparently attain no visible success within an immediate period, and which because of this is subject to the stigma of ridicule. A member of a minority party finds himself on election day, when the ecstasy of the statistical success of the great party reaches its highest point, when all the newspapers are displaying the electoral success of their candidates in giant letters, when the figures of the presidential election are thrown upon gigantic transparencies, compelled to stand at one side with martyr-like resignation,—something which in no way accords with the American temperament.

Furthermore this sense of measurable greatness in connection with the radically democratic foundation of their institutions has created among Americans a blind worship of majorities. These must be on the right road he reasons, otherwise they would not be in a majority. How can the great mass of people be wrong? It is this that Bryce has characterized with the striking

expression, "the fatalism of the multitude." Along with this respect for great numbers of voters as such, there goes the inclination of the American to desire to work in common with many others, a characteristic which has already been designated as their gregariousness. This characteristic, which leads to the formation of all parties, whether large or small, works especially to the advantage of the great parties, because it gives rise to a strong feeling of faithfulness and loyalty to the chosen herd. This expresses itself in a fanatical party loyalism. In order to fully realize this blind enthusiasm for party membership it is necessary to attend some "great" mass meeting. Ostrogorski has expressed this as follows: "Like an ancient Greek, who found in the most distant colonies his national deities, and the fire from the sacred hearth of his *Polis*, the American finds in his nomadic existence everywhere, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Maine to Florida, a Republican organization or a Democratic organization, which recalls him to himself, gives him a countenance and makes him repeat with pride the cry of the New York politician, "I am a Democrat," or "I am a Republican."

So it is that many motives both of a materialistic and idealistic nature work together for the same result,—to maintain the size and power of the great parties and thereby to secure their political monopoly: they have this monopoly because they are the "great" parties, and they are the great parties, because they have this monopoly.

(To be Continued.)

WERNER SOMBART,

Translated by A. M. Simons.

in Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft.

The Labor Theory of Value in the Light of Recent Criticism.

I N the introductory article of this series, in speaking of the criticism and the critics of the Materialistic conception of history, we have observed that the discussion of the subject was very much obscured by certain prejudices existing against the theory, which prevented any unbiased examination of the subject on its merits. This must be repeated and even emphasized with reference to the criticism of Marx's theory of value and surplus value. It is safe to say that at least one-half of the adverse criticism of this theory contained in the literature of the subject is due to prejudice which obscures the vision of the critics and puts their thinking apparatus out of joint. This prejudice is not confined to any particular category of critics. It affects the dignified scholar and the fighting publicist alike. The great Böhm-Bawerck, head and front of the "scientific" Austrian school of political economy, and the prating "popular" Professor Masaryk are both fair specimens of it. In his great work on capital and interest, where more than one hundred pages are devoted to the criticism of this theory, Böhm-Bawerck starts out his examination of the theory by characterizing it as the theory of exploitation, and the whole trend of his argument is directed towards one objective point:— to prove that the supposedly main thesis of this theory, that the income of the capitalists is the result of exploitation, is untrue; that in reality the working-man is getting all that is due to him under the present system. And the whole of his argument is colored by this conception of the discussion as a controversy relative to the ethical merits or demerits of the capitalist system. The same is true of Masaryk. In his bulky book on Marxism the examination of the problem of value and surplus value starts out with the following introductory remarks:

"Sociologically the conception of surplus-value stands foremost. Surplus-value is the economic expression of the social conception of the classes and their mutual relations,—of their struggle. The expression Surplus-value is intended to characterize and *condemn* the whole capitalistic order and civilization. It is obvious: *Das Kapital* is not a positive theory of economy, but, as is indicated by the sub-title, a critique of the science of economics to the present time. *Das Kapital* presents the theory of capitalistic exploitation. It is a text-book of capitalistic ex-

tortion, and at the same time its vehement denunciation. *Das Kapital* is therefore at the same time the theory of the Socialist revolution,—yes, it is the revolution itself.

“As already stated, we will concentrate our criticism on the conception of value and surplus-value. We will investigate whether or not, labor, the labor of the proletarians, is the only source of economic value and surplus-value. Such an investigation squarely presents the question whether or not the social order of civilization really means the exploitation of the proletariat by the capitalist class—the criticism of Capital will resolve itself into a further investigation of the doctrine of the Class Struggle.”

We therefore advisedly stated in the last article that in employing the adjectives “necessary” and “surplus” in connection with labor or value, it is not intended to convey any meaning of praise or justification in the case of the one, nor of condemnation or derogation in the case of the other. As a matter of fact, Marx repeatedly stated that the capitalist was paying to the workman all that was due him when he paid him the fair market value of his labor-power. In describing the process of capitalist production Marx used the words, “necessary” and “surplus” in characterizing the amounts of labor which are necessarily employed in reproducing what Society already possesses and that employed in producing new commodities or values. He intended to merely state the facts as he saw them, and not to hold a brief for anybody. If his theory of value and surplus value and his condemnation of the capitalist system stood in any causal relation, (and the determination of this question we will leave for the future) his theory of value and surplus value was the cause, and his condemnation of the capitalist system the effect, rather than the reverse. The statements of many of his critics, that Marx was influenced in his examination of the question of value and surplus value by a pre-determined thesis in favor of which he intended to hold a brief, is absolutely false, and the writings of these very critics contain abundant proof of this assertion. At some future time we will discuss the so-called ethical theory of the Socialist movement which is so much in vogue among many of the latter-day Marx critics, and it will then appear beyond the possibility of a doubt that it was only his intense craving for the absolute and unalloyed truth that guided Marx in his examination of the subject which led him to the formulation of his theory of value and surplus value.

We saw in preceding articles what the problem which confronted Marx at the outset of his examination, and which required solution at his hands is,—Is his solution a true one? That is, or at least should be, the only question before us. Is Marx's theory of value and surplus value viewed without any

bias or prejudice correct? It is very much to be regretted that we cannot, for the lack of space, preface our examination of the Marxist theory of value and surplus value with an examination of the other theories of this subject. Such an examination and a juxtaposition of the different theories would be an invaluable aid in the arriving at a true answer to the question before us, and it is the fond hope of the present writer that he will at some future day be able to do this work, so that the relative position of the Marxian theory may be fully appreciated. In this present discussion, however, we will have to be guided by, so-to-speak, absolute standards rather than relative ones, and other theories of value will only be gone into in so far as is absolutely necessary to the discussion of the main criticism leveled against the Marxian theory. This particularly applies to the so-called "modern" theory of value familiarly known as the Austrian, although by origin and popularity England has as much claim upon it as Austria. This "honorable mention" of the Austrian theory of value is due not so much to its own originality or importance, as to the fact that it seems to be the prevailing one among the latter-day Marx critics, Böhm-Bawerck himself taking the lead in the particular field of inquiry now under discussion.

While, as we have already stated in the introductory article, each tub of anti-Marxian criticism lays claim and is entitled to stand on its own bottom, in the discussion of the Marxian theory of value and surplus value, we will, to a great extent, have to limit ourselves to the arguments advanced by Böhm-Bawerck. The reason for it is two-fold: first, because Böhm-Bawerck is so far superior to his comrades in arms, and his authority on the subject is acknowledged by them to such an extent, that it can hardly be claimed to be unfair to these critics, to pick Böhm-Bawerck as an example of them all. Second, because there seems to be quite a good deal of unanimity among these critics on this particular point, and the arguments advanced by the others are either directly borrowed from Böhm-Bawerck, very often with an acknowledgment of receipt, or are variations on the same tune deserving no particular attention. Where the variation is sufficiently distinct to make a difference, it will be duly noted, as will, certainly, all those arguments which have any claim to an independent source.

Böhm-Bawerck starts out by stating that all the predecessors of Marx who have adhered either in whole or in part to the labor theory of value, including such great lights of the science as Adam Smith, David Ricardo and Karl Rodbertus, have really "assumed" the labor theory of value without even as much as attempting to prove it. It was pure assertion on their part, without the semblance of an argument to support it. Karl Marx

was the first one who not merely asserted the labor theory of value, but also attempted to prove it. In this Böhm-Bawerck recognizes Marx's superiority to the great luminaries of the science of political economy who have preceded him on this subject. But he does not like the way Marx did it and is not convinced by the proof offered by Marx in support of his theory. Böhm-Bawerck, like the good professor that he is, instructs us as to how Marx should have gone about the job of proving his theory of value and puts his emphatic disapproval on the way Marx is supposed to have actually gone about it. He says that there were two ways open to Marx: first, to analyze the "psychological motives," to which the process of exchange is due; or, second, to examine the actual "experiences" of the relations of exchange. Instead of adopting either of these two courses, he says, Marx adopted a third rather peculiar one for the subject of this inquiry, namely, that of purely logical deduction and dialectic argumentation.

That Marx did not go about the task of discovering the true laws of exchange-value by way of an analysis of the "psychological motives" of exchange is perfectly true. And we have already seen in the preceding article the reason for it. The problem by its very nature showed that its solution lay in some social phenomenon and not in any attribute of the individuals entering into the relation of exchange. The "psychological motives," therefore, of exchange, could not possibly have anything to do with the problems that confronted Marx. Aside from that, it was very evident that "psychological," as well as other "natural" motives or causes which remain unchanged throughout the history of mankind, could not be the cause, nor offer any explanation, of the phenomena of capitalist production and distribution which are not common to all human society, but are strictly limited in time as well as in place to only a small portion thereof. It is the same thing that we have already observed in discussing the Materialistic Conception of History:—a constant factor cannot possibly be the cause of a change in the result of an operation.

It is not true, however, that Marx did not adopt the course of examining the actual experiences of exchange relation. Nor is it true that the course he did adopt was that of purely logical deduction. Marx did go about by making a thorough examination of the actual happenings and "experiences" of the exchange relation as Böhm-Bawerck would have him do, although this job did not prove so very "simple" as Böhm-Bawerck imagined it would. In order, however, that he might learn something that was worth while from the actual "experiences" of the exchange relation, he had to put these "relations" to a very careful analysis.

In doing that he was certainly guilty of using some very sharp and pure logical reasoning. In this he could not help himself, as he was "naturally" so constituted that to whatever task he applied himself, he could not help but use his logic. And that was of the very purest sort. There were, however, no purely logical constructions or abstractions used by him in order to prove his theory of value or surplus value. Those abstractions which he did make, and they will be duly noted, one by one, in the course of these articles, were not only justified, but required and demanded by the subject matter itself. But he did not start out with any purely logical notions or abstractions, nor did he proceed to any purely logical constructions. On the contrary, he kept to his base all the time, and that was the solid ground of the facts of capitalistic production and exchange. It is very significant that in the whole volume of Marx's economic writings there is no mention of the "economic man" or of his supposed attributes, "psychological" or otherwise. Nor is any kind of an abstract man part of his discussion. Throughout his entire work he keeps strictly to his problem, and that is the doings of the real, live man in the real historic situation known as the capitalistic system. In this connection it is more than a mere curiosity to compare the opening passage of *Capital* with the opening passages in the works of some of his illustrious predecessors and contemporaries.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)

Owing to the space required for Bebel's speech much of the current installment of Comrade Boudin's article has been crowded out, but will appear next month. — ED.

EDITORIAL

Conditions in Germany and America.

The speech of August Bebel at the Jena Congress, published elsewhere in this issue, is a sign of a new epoch upon which we are just entering. The conditions which he there describes, although so apparently local in names and geographical position, yet are really international in their character. The fundamental facts there set forth are that we are in the midst of a general re-action, that the great bourgeois liberal movement has reached its limit, and that as a consequence new tasks and new duties devolve upon the socialist movement, which in turn demand new tactics and new methods of fighting. Upon the Socialist party from now on must rest the burden of social progress. Capitalism seems to have reached its limit, to have perfected society as far as its social mission will permit. As a consequence it is now caught in the back-wash of re-action.

All over the world comes the same story of a stoppage in all reformatory liberalizing movements. We venture to suggest the following as a possible explanation of this, in accordance with the doctrines of the class struggle. As long as any ruling class feels perfectly secure in its position *as a ruler* it can still afford to grant concessions in order to prevent the rise of any effective opposition, but as soon as its actual domination is threatened, and then its existence as a class, it looks upon every position which it occupies as of probable value in its coming conflict for life,—consequently it is not disposed to yield even the apparently most unimportant outpost. So long as the socialist movement was still too weak to constitute an effective threat its every increase only caused the capitalists to look with greater favor upon reforms which might be expected to stay its progress. But when that socialist movement has reached a strength where a struggle for existence is imminent then the ruling class is no longer disposed to yield even the slightest concessions..

The facts bear out the theory. In America, as in Europe, the last three years have been marked by a more stubborn resistance on the part of the plutocratic rulers of society. It has become a common-place to say that the trades unions have failed to accomplish anything during the last three years. Almost every strike has been a failure and this in the face of the fact that during these years we have been in the midst of

what is probably the greatest "prosperity" that capitalism has ever known. It has been a time of rising prices, of expanding industries,—an upward swing of the industrial pendulum. Every other such period in our history has been marked by a rapid growth of labor organizations and by continuous concessions wrung by them from the capitalists, who were willing to grant these slight concessions rather than suffer a complete destruction of the enormous profits which such a period brings to an exploiting class. In the period which has just passed, however, the reverse has been true, even governmental statistics concede the fact that a period of rising prices has been accompanied by a stationary, if not a receding wage rate. Everywhere employers' associations, citizens' alliances, and similar organizations of the exploiting classes have grown stronger in numbers, more defiant in resistance, more aggressive in attack.

Such a condition, presenting new problems, demands new weapons on the part of the working class. Realizing the fact that we are now about to enter upon the beginning of the end it behooves us to become more constructive in our propositions, more thorough in our education, more perfect in our organization, more active in our agitation. These, however, are commonplaces, which, however, lose nothing of emphatic necessity by reason of their familiarity. But capitalism reaches ever backward into its armory to bring forth new weapons in support of the power of entrenched wealth. They have added new weapons, drawn from political institutions depending for their effectiveness upon the ignorance of the workers. To the black list and the lockout they add the injunction and the brutal force of military and police power.

Moreover this wave of reaction has extended also to the legislative chambers. A slight examination of the legislation of the last three years will show that the gains which have been made along lines usually looked upon as reformatory in their character, such as factory legislation, or the democratization of institutions, have been almost *nil* and certainly in no way comparable to the similar gains made in the same number of years a decade or so ago. Moreover there seems to be a tendency to destroy the power of governmental institutions in those departments which are most accessible to working class influence.

As yet, however, this movement has not proceeded to a point in the United States where it requires any immediate action but it is well to be warned in time and the working class of America should show its determination to prepare for the new problems which will be presented. It, too, must be ready to use every weapon at its disposal. In no way relaxing the emphasis to be laid upon political action, it must be prepared to strengthen its activity in other directions. I say in no way relaxing its political activity; on the contrary there is still every reason to believe that in the United States the political field must still be the one on which the great battles will be fought. The political organization is the only one which can embrace all workers. It is the only one which is in any way prepared to "take and hold" the titles to the means for the production and distribution of wealth. It is the only one which

in any way can represent all the producing classes and it is essential at this time that this fact be recognized and that the workers be not led away with anarchistic or demagogic denials of this position. At the same time as the most powerful auxiliary in the fight must stand the economic organization of the working class and it is easily possible that when the fight reaches a climax the decisive blow may be struck with this weapon. Above all it is essential that the two weapons should be wielded with the same object in view. If, as is too often the case at the present time, the economic organization is paralyzed either by ignorance or treachery, then it is easily possible that the political fight may be so hampered in the battle as to be incapable of gaining a victory.

In Germany this situation has convinced practically the entire German Social Democracy of the necessity of utilizing the great organizations of labor as a means of battle. We shall need to do the same before long. To do this demands two things; first the organization of the working class along industrial lines permitting immediate and wide spread united action; and second, close co-operation between the political and economic movement in order that the two forces may work in harmony. This is the strongest argument in support of the Industrial Workers of the World and the one which is bound to give it increasing strength and power with every passing day. If however, this organization accepts the ridiculous anarcho-socialist position advocated by De Leon and Haggarty and which is so well satirized in Bebel's great speech, then it will soon degenerate into a mere caricature of a labor movement.

However, we can assure our readers that there is no danger of such a thing taking place. The Industrial Workers is growing and developing among genuine working men far faster than among the mere praters of phrases and intriguing schemers. The power of the intelligent constructive portion is already so great that it is only a question of a short time when the element which now retards its progress will be scraped off.

There are other lessons regarding party organization and activity to be drawn from this same situation, but these we reserve for a later time.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

NORWAY.

The Norwegian socialists continue to carry on an active campaign for a Republic. They are demanding that the form of government be submitted to a referendum. The capitalist parties very naturally are opposing this, but the popular demand is so great that it is quite probable that they will have to yield. A provision to this effect has already been introduced into the Storting and large meetings are being held throughout the country to arouse enthusiasm.

SWEDEN.

It is impossible to give exact figures concerning the recent parliamentary elections, because of the fact that in several cases alliances were made with other parties. Vorwaerts however, estimates that about 30,000 socialist votes were cast, 14 socialist candidates were elected; three years ago there were only 10,000 votes cast and 4 representatives elected.

HUNGARY.

The agitation for universal suffrage proceeds with ever increasing vigor. The Kossuth party, which was elected under a pledge to work for universal suffrage, has broken its pledge and joined the coalition of capitalist parties in fighting to the utmost the popularization of suffrage. As a result the class lines have become much sharper than ever before. Popular uprising, strikes, mass meetings, and demonstrations have reached a point where the country is not far from open revolt.

RUSSIA.

Events are happening so fast in Russia that it is impossible to give any real news in competition with the daily papers. So far as the general situation is concerned the government of the Czar has practically disappeared, and has been followed by chaos, politically and socially. A careful examination of the situation makes it seem probable at least that events are proceeding somewhat as follows:

There will probably be a year or two of practically continuous revolution, much as is being carried on at the present time. This is only possible in a country, which, like Russia is really a great political jelly fish, with no particular head either to direct its rule or to be crushed. Some time in the midst of this chaos the autocracy will probably be formally abolished as it now is in reality. The next most coherent body in the empire is still the capitalist class and these, with some such men as

Witte at the head will be apt to form a capitalist "liberal" government. But at the same time the proletarian element is too strong to permit this stage to be in any way permanent and it is probable that revolution will succeed revolution until Western Europe is involved, probably through a revolt of Russian Poland, affecting the German portion of Poland. It is easily possible that Russia may prove the spark that will set off a proletarian revolution throughout the world.

Meanwhile the socialists of Russia are certainly showing a remarkable coherence and power of organization, considering the backward state of the country and there is at least a strong probability that somewhere in the midst of the resulting chaos a proletarian government may be established.

The above was written before the granting of a "constitution", and the assumption of power by Witte, but we let it stand as justified by these events and as a probable outline of future happenings.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

When this number of the REVIEW is being printed the American Federation of Labor is assembling in Pittsburg. While no advance information has been given out other than the proceedings of the quarterly sessions of the executive council, it is probable that the officers' reports will show that the Federation has held its own during the past year, although some of the fiercest struggles in organized labor's history have been waged. Certainly some of the affiliated bodies that were on the firing line have been hit hard, but others have enjoyed a slow steady growth that has offset the losses so that the membership remains pretty close to the two million mark. In at least one particular the Federation has made a marked gain, and that is in the greater solidarity that has become manifest among the rank and file, while the spread of knowledge upon economic and political questions has also added strength to the movement. It follows as a matter of course that some unions are bound to lose members, especially after an organization boom has spent its force, where the new converts remain ignorant of the principles, tactics or mission of the body they have joined, and where their sole ambition and expectation is to pay in fifty cents and receive a five-dollar raise in wages or a reduction of hours handed out on a silver platter. The time is past when such bonanzas are struck, and nowadays it requires mighty hard fighting and considerable sacrifice to gain concessions, to say nothing of holding fast to what has been gained. This fact is appreciated by the active men in the ranks—leaving the "leaders" entirely out of the calculation for the time being—and personal investigation will prove that there is a distinct improvement in the intellectual tone and the spirit of class-consciousness. One don't hear that old piece of stereotyped sophistry that "the interests of labor and capital are identical," or that "capital and labor are brothers," in the lodge rooms or in the labor press as often as formerly. Such expressions are now the exception rather than the rule. The members are gradually but surely obtaining a clearer conception of things as they are; they have learned by bitter experience, and are still in school, that capital is adamant when labor demands more of the wealth it produces, and consequently threatens to cut into dividends. And so it has come to pass that those among the membership who wandered in the wilderness and preached economic truths, and who were denounced and ridiculed until many gave up the struggle in despair, are now listened to gladly and in many industrial centres they are trusted and honored by their fellow-workmen. In other words, the trade union movement, in spite of opposition without and reaction within, is undergoing a perceptible change, and the evolution is all in the direction of socialism. That there will be internal wars between factions, disorganization and reorganization, and bitter contests with capital, in the future as in the past, goes without saying, but throughout it all the clarifying process will go on and the general enlightenment that is bound to follow will result in

the unions being found in the vanguard of the fight for labor's emancipation. This is not idle speculation, but views based upon careful study of the situation and everyday contact with actual conditions. Old ideas and methods and leaders are being superseded, and every progressive worker who hopes and struggles for a better day for his class can afford to regard the future with confidence and satisfaction, and his optimism will be well-founded. The intellectual proletariat is coming in a mighty army of conquest.

The overshadowing question in trade union circles at present is the threatened suspension of work in the anthracite and bituminous mining districts next spring. This cloud on the industrial horizon is growing in proportion as the weeks and months pass, and there is no longer any doubt that the struggle will come on schedule time. The officers and organizers of the miners are working feverishly, night and day, to thoroughly unionize the various districts and to strengthen every weak point. During the past few months President Mitchell has taken personal control of the field work and appealed to the men who have become careless and lukewarm in their unionism to flock to his standard and prepare to resist the encroachments of the combines of capital that are thirsting for greater profits, no matter how deep into poverty and misery they force their workers. On the other hand the coal barons, who now possess the power to raise and lower prices at will, are making their usual excuses that the market is overstocked with coal and prices are too low. Some of them even go so far as to insult the miners, as well as the intelligence of the rest of the people, by claiming that their employees are the only ones who are making money and ungratefully refuse to accept wage reductions, and thus are forcing a general stagnation in the industry. Therefore, the operators declare, they are compelled to make a cut of 25 per cent in wages or close their mines to save themselves from ruin. Meanwhile, however, the poor, unsophisticated mine owners, who are forced to live in mansions and clip coupons and make trips to Europe as a penalty for their extreme generosity, are piling up mountains of coal in anticipation of the shutdown, and, by arbitrarily raising prices because of the "scarcity" of coal, they will fairly revel in prosperity next year, while the dear people, who vote for private ownership of mines, dig deeper into their jeans if they would keep from freezing a year hence and while many a miner makes side jumps toward the poorhouse. So once again there is coming a great crisis in the class struggle, and while the suffering will be severe in some quarters it is likewise certain that the unbridled plutocracy, which appears to have become afflicted with a mania to "teach the people a lesson" ever so often, while on its periodical drunks, will only hasten its own downfall.

Whether or not the forcing of a great coal strike next year is part of a widespread conspiracy or an understanding among certain groups of capitalists to raid stocks, produce a financial panic, crush small competitors and then confiscate the securities they have managed to hang to just as drowning men clutch at straws, is not quite plain: but it is significant that the monarch of the financial world, Mr. John D. Rockefeller, who can smell an honest dollar at a greater distance than any captain of industry that ever stood in shoe leather, has confided to Col. W. H. Moore, of Chicago, president of the National Good Roads Association, the information "that America's greatest panic was coming in 1907 and 1908." Col. Moore is an enthusiastic agitator for improved highways, and would have the United States government engage in the paternalistic undertaking of employing thousands of men to provide good roads upon which "the

people" can speed their fast horses and faster automobiles, while at the same time his philanthropic soul yearns to create work for the working-man. The colonel differs from the famous Coxey in that the latter waited until the panic of 1893 was upon us, and then marched the wrong class of people to Washington to demand relief from Congress in the shape of good road building, and, as history records, Mr. Coxey was arrested for walking upon aristocratic grass and after being released hiked back to Ohio, ran for governor and dropped into political oblivion. Col. Moore has started to march upon Washington before the storm breaks, and his "commonweal" army will be composed of a class of men who will be greeted with the glad hand by the politicians. With the irrepressible Coxey appealed for non-interest-bearing bonds with which to make public improvements, and which would have been nothing more nor less than irredeemable paper money, or greenbacks, the Moore crowd will demand the genuine article in the bondage game, the kind that stipulates that interest must be paid in gold. The whole scheme will work out automatically, and those in on the ground floor will be enabled to kill three or four birds with one stone. When the panic comes a year or so hence the plutocrats can easily embrace the opportunity to deal organized labor a smash by blaming the hard times on the tyrannical strikers; then they can "bear" the market, call in loans and tighten money, and drive the small-fry into bankruptcy; then along comes obliging Uncle Sam and issues tens of millions of bonds, and our patriotic Rockefeller and Morgan bankers will do a fine business by selling the bonds to themselves at a big profit, and providing safe investments for part of their hoardings, while with their surplus and profits and interest they can go into the market when the lowest notch has been reached and gather up the wreckage at their own price and sit back and wait for a rise later. There's millions in it; heads we win, tails you lose. Every business man in the country knows (whether workingmen do or do not is immaterial) that when Rockefeller discusses industrial affairs he speaks with authority, and whether or not the financial king understands the Socialist philosophy regarding the cause of panics or it is mere instinct cultivated by long experience in chasing the almighty dollar is also immaterial at this juncture. The fact remains that this shrewd and coldly calculating genius has confided to his friend Moore that another crisis may be looked for in a year or two. He bases his statement, so we are informed, on the view that there is overproduction in all lines. "Where there were 3,000,000 men out of work in 1893," Mr. Rockefeller is quoted as saying by Col. Moore, "there will be from 7,000,000 to 10,000,000 in idleness when the next siege of hard times is upon us." This is a calamitous prediction, surely; and if it should be realized how many labor organizations, no matter upon what lines they may be formed, could safely ride the waves of the oncoming storm? And what guarantee is there that the whole system of capitalistic exploitation will not go by the board during this threatened catastrophe? It is interesting to note, too, that after capitalism is unable to extricate itself from the depths of iniquity into which its own stupidity, planlessness and criminal system has plunged it, the governmental machinery is called to the rescue. Now if the powers of government can be utilized to enrich a small class and impoverish the working class, and then can be further employed to provide soup-houses or temporary jobs for millions of men and thus prolong the existence of an unjust, inequitable system, why cannot the working masses arise in their might and throw off the shirking classes and run their own government for their own welfare? This can and undoubtedly will happen when the trade unions, who have an advantage in being already organized, and the working people generally accept the Socialist program.

The struggle between the printers and their organized employers

has been raging with considerable bitterness during the past month. The men have been making steady gains despite the support that has been given the bosses by pretty much all the employers' association in the country. Upward of 300 local unions, almost one-half, have either succeeded in enforcing the eight-hour day or obtained agreements to introduce the shorter workday on January 1. It is only fair to say that the boss printers were not as thoroughly organized as are the capitalists in some other branches of industry, but on the other hand all the resources of the Parry Manufacturers' Association and Post's Citizens' Alliance have been thrown to the support of the master class in the printing trade. The International Typographical union officials are not inclined to underestimate the forces that confront the printers in their fight for the eight-hour day, and it is expected that the battle will continue for weeks and perhaps months before their demands are won. It is quite probable, too, that many offices and a number of cities and towns will be lost, at least temporarily, but the campaign will go on despite those obstacles, and where there are losses the lines will be reorganized and the battle begun anew. All eyes of the labor world are now upon the Typographical Union, and for that matter the capitalists of the country also regard the present contest as being of far-reaching effect.

BOOK REVIEWS

TEXT BOOK OF SOCIOLOGY, by James Q. Bealey and Lester F. Ward. The Macmillan Co.. Cloth 326 pages \$1.30.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIOLOGY, by Edward A. Ross. The Macmillan Co. "Citizens' Library," Half leather, 410 pages. \$1.25 net.

These books are illustrative of the progress which is being made in the creation of a science of society and are but two out of a large number that have come from the presses of the world during the last year. Both are still characteristic of the undeveloped stage of the science. They do not seem to be sure of their right to exist as yet and are still largely on the defensive. A considerable portion of their contents is taken up with an explanation of what sociology is, and in discussions of such fundamental principles as in text books of other sciences are taken for granted.

The positions of Prof. Ward are already so well known to our readers through reviews of his previous books as to require no extensive summary of the present work. This is all the more true since this book is but a compilation of his previous writings. On the whole he seeks to analyze society as a biological organism, although in no way following and seldom agreeing with Spencer. He finds the motive force of society in feeling and the desire for social achievement. Although avowedly psychological, yet the materialist will find few things to quarrel with in his position.

He recognizes the existence of exploitation in our present system and states that "those artificial social inequalities which enable the prosperous class to thrive at the expense of the proletariat, and of the less favored classes where no true proletariat exists, are maintained through the systematic deception of the latter, and the inculcation through religious beliefs, when not otherwise possible, of the doctrine that the existing social conditions is not only natural and necessary but divinely ordained." He says that, "the less favored classes are beginning to learn the power of their ballots and are casting them in increasing numbers for collectivism." He is sharply differentiated from Herbert Spencer in his recognition of the fact that "collectivism is not the opposite of individualism," but on the contrary this "whole movement" may almost be described as a growth of individualism.

Here and in various other places he has borrowed directly from the socialists and indeed much of his fundamental position is to be found in the writings of Marx, Engels and Ferri. It is noteworthy, however, that, although he gives a very full bibliography none of these names appear in it. It would seem about time that Prof. Ward woke up to the fact that common scholastic honesty requires that he state the fact that he has been anticipated in many of his positions by these writers.

Prof. Ross's work is very strikingly different in its treatment of the subject. This again is significant of the still unsettled state of sociology. His book is largely a summary of the positions of other writers and as such is of peculiar value in bringing together the various contributions

so far made to the subject. Along with this, however, goes much valuable original matter. He looks upon social psychology as an outgrowth of mob psychology and discusses the evolution of this incoherent mind into the more organized forms of social unity. His chapter on the "Factors of Social Change," while containing much of value is on the whole decidedly weak. He seems to be seized too much with the ultra-scholastic position that it is absolutely necessary to find a multitude of causes for every phenomena and to avoid drawing any general conclusions. Indeed he warns against this latter repeatedly throughout his work, yet is not himself averse to making such generalizations at times as is especially evident from the last two chapters. Among the factors of social change he finds no fundamental motive force and absolutely ignores the only philosophy which has in any way studied into and described the existence of such a motive force, the materialistic interpretation of history.

The charge against him with regard to the socialist writers is in some ways even worse than with Ward, for while Ward ignores them entirely and pretends to have re-discovered anew things that have long been familiar in socialist literature it remains for Ross to make the astounding statement that "To Italians like Loria, and Vaccaro, to the German Ratzehofer, to the Austrian Pole Gumplowicz and to the Russian Novicow belongs the credit of first setting forth the forms, phrases and laws of the struggles that persist in the interior of society." Is it possible that a man who has read so widely as Prof. Ross is not aware of the exposures of the dishonesty of the writers named which have been made by the socialists and which show that they have simply stolen wholesale and sometimes verbatim from the socialist writers, and especially from Marx and Engels. He certainly must have read Seligman's *Economic Interpretation of History* which would have shown him how false is the statement he makes. A fundamental weakness which is closely connected with the defect just mentioned is seen in the lack of any consistent social philosophy. They absolutely refuse to notice the existence of the socialist school, and up to the present time this is the only school which offers any coherent evolutionary social philosophy, whether true or false.

Notwithstanding these criticisms which we feel bound to make, since the time is now past when ignorance of socialist doctrines may be pleaded as an excuse by men of the wide reading of the authors of these two books, nevertheless they have done work which no socialist can afford to neglect. Both of them have made themselves dangerous to plutocracy and both of them have made what are by no means unimportant contributions to the socialist doctrines. It is well worth the while of any socialist to familiarize himself with their writings as a valuable help to the understanding of his own doctrines, as well as to show how thoroughly our philosophy has permeated into the intellectual life of even those who shut their eyes to its existence.

THE NAPOLEON MYTH, by Henry Ridgely Evans, *The Open Court Publishing Co.* Cloth, 65 pp.

"By looking only at the beginning and at the end of his career, and by disregarding all the intermediate period, an imaginary Napoleon has been created, who is a republican, not a despot; a lover of liberty, not an authoritarian; a champion of the Revolution, not the destroyer of the Revolution; a hero of independence, not a conqueror; a friend of the people, not a contemner of the people; a man of heart and virtue, not a ruthless militarist, cynic and Maciavellian." This imaginary character has become a legendary hero, a demi-god, in which truth and myth are so confused as to be almost impossible of separation. Some phases of this myth are considered in this little work, which is rather a study in higher criticism than an historical contribution.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

SCIENCE AND REVOLUTION.

This new book by Ernest Untermann, the fourth volume of the Library of Science for the Workers, is one of the most important works yet produced by the American socialist movement. The author has made a thorough and exhaustive study of the development of scientific thought from the dawn of literature to the present day.

He recognizes frankly that no thinker can escape the subtle influence of industrial conditions and class environment. Therefore while showing how previous thinkers have consciously or unconsciously shaped their philosophies in the interest of ruling classes, he openly admits that he writes as a proletarian and a socialist.

The earlier portion of the book is with some modifications made up from the articles published in the International Review from March to September. The concluding chapters are a clear and adequate statement of the socialist interpretation of the latest facts of science.

"Science and Revolution" is thus an indispensable help to an understanding of the relations of the sciences to each other and to the socialist movement, and it thus adds immensely to the propaganda value of the Library of Science for the Workers.

THE EVOLUTION OF MAN.

Of this illustrated work, translated by Ernest Untermann from the German of Wilhelm Boelsche, 3500 copies have already been sold, and another edition is now in press. It contains in simple language and attractive style enough evidence to convince any open-minded man that the evolution theory has been absolutely proved, and that the idea of special creation rests on nothing but inherited prejudice. This is volume I of the Library of Science. The second volume is

GERMS OF MIND IN PLANTS,

translated by A. M. Simons from the German of R. H. Francé. This book is a simple record of observed facts which prove to any logical reader that "mind" is only another form of "life" and is subject to the same laws as the rest of the universe. This thought is developed still further in the third volume of the library,

THE END OF THE WORLD.

by Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Margaret Wagner. Dr. Meyer shows that worlds and suns are organisms like plants and people, having their birth, growth, maturity, old age and death, only that the periods of time involved are vastly longer.

Fifty cents a volume is the price of these books, postage included, and they are sold to stockholders at thirty cents if we prepay postage or expressage; twenty-five cents if called for at this office or sent by express at purchaser's expense.

WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE FOR STOCK NOW?

A share of stock in the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company costs ten dollars, payable all at once or a dollar a month as the subscriber prefers. When the share is fully paid for, the subscriber has no further liability of any kind. No dividends are paid, but stockholders have the privilege of buying books at cost. The money received from the sale of stock is used to publish more books. Ernest Untermann is now translating the later volumes of Marx's "Capital" which have never yet appeared in English. To publish them will take an investment of three thousand dollars. That means 300 new subscriptions for stock at ten dollars each. And it means that both new stockholders and present stockholders will get Marx's great work complete at a small fraction of what it would cost through capitalist channels.

Meanwhile we shall be making rapid additions to our list of books by American and European socialists. Several more volumes of the Library of Science for the Workers will be definitely announced next month. Two handsome five-cent pamphlets are in press, "Science and Life," by Enrico Ferri, and "A Socialist View of Mr. Rockefeller," by John Spargo. The first edition of 800,000 propaganda leaflets by Charles H. Kerr is sold out, and another edition of 800,000 more is just ready. This includes a new leaflet, "Free Americans," which will be mailed for 6 cents a hundred and sent at purchaser's expense for 30 cents a thousand, and the set of five leaflets "What Socialists Think," mailed for 30 cents per hundred sets or sent by express for \$1.50 per thousand sets. The New York state committee alone has used 40,000 sets of these leaflets and Local Cleveland has used 30,000 sets. Samples will be sent free on request.

THE DEBT-RAISING FUND.

On pages 255 and 256 of last month's Review it was explained that the offer of Charles H. Kerr to duplicate the contributions of other stockholders for the purpose of putting the publishing house on a cash basis was addressed rather to those who could give money more conveniently than they could give active work in the circulation of socialist literature. It naturally happens therefore that the number of contributions to

acknowledge this month is smaller than before. It is a matter for congratulation on the part of all stockholders that the amount received is larger, as will be seen from the following list:

Previously Acknowledged	\$ 920.36
John R. Haynes, Calif.	20.00
Thomas C. Hall, New York	25.00
Fred R. Bennett, Maine	2.00
L. K. Hill, Ohio56
A. F. Simonds, New York	1.00
Harry T. Smith, Illinois	2.00
Howard Keehn, Pennsylvania	1.00
N. O. Nelson, Missouri	100.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	151.56
<hr/>	
Total	\$1223.48

It is particularly gratifying to be able to report that the receipts of the International Socialist Review for the month of October were \$233.56, an amount which comes so near to covering the expenses for the month that if this average can only be maintained the slight deficit can readily be taken care of out of the profits on the sale of books.

The moral is, not that, nothing more need be done for the Review, but that, it is possible for its friends by reasonable efforts to assure its future publication.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

DECEMBER, 1905

NO. 6

The Significance of the Frontier in American History.¹

IN a bulletin of the Superintendent of the Census for 1890 appear these significant words: "Up to and including 1880 the country had a frontier of settlement, but at present the unsettled area has been so broken into by isolated bodies of settlement that there can hardly be said to be a frontier line. In the discussion of its extent, its westward movement, etc., it cannot, therefore, any longer have a place in the census reports."² This brief official statement marks the closing of a great historic movement. Up to our own day American history has been in a large degree the history of the colonization of the West. The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development. Behind institutions, behind constitutional forms and modifications, lie the vital forces that call these organs into life, and shape them to meet changing conditions. The peculiarity of American institutions is, the fact that they have been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people—to the changes involved in crossing a continent, in winning a wilderness, and in developing at each area of this progress out of the primitive economic and political conditions of the frontier into the complexity of city life. Said Cal-

¹ The article here reprinted was published in the Report of the American Historical Association, 1893, pp. 199-227; in the Proceedings of the Wisconsin Historical Society, XLI, 79-112; and in an enlarged form, in Fifth Year Book of the National Herbart Society, 7-40.

² Extra Census Bulletin, No. 2, April 20, 1892.

houn in 1817, "We are great, and rapidly—I was about to say fearfully—growing!" So saying, he touched the distinguishing feature of American life. All peoples show development; the germ theory of politics has been sufficiently emphasized. In the case of most nations, however, the development has occurred in a limited area; and if the nation has expanded, it has met other growing peoples whom it has conquered. But in the case of the United States we have a different phenomenon. Limiting our attention to the Atlantic coast, we have the familiar phenomenon of the evolutions of institutions in a limited area, such as the rise of representative government; the differentiation of simple colonial governments into complex organs; the progress from primitive industrial society, without division of labor, up to manufacturing civilization. But we have in addition to this a recurrence of the process of evolution in each western area reached in the process of expansion. Thus American development has exhibited not merely advance along a single line, but a return to primitive conditions on a continually advancing frontier line, and a new development for that area. American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier. This perennial rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities, its continuous touch with the simplicity of primitive society, furnish the forces dominating American character. The true point of view in the history of this nation is not the Atlantic coast, it is the great West. Even the slavery struggle, which is made so exclusive an object of attention by some historians, occupies its important place in American history because of its relation to westward expansion.

In this advance, the frontier is the outer edge of the wave—the meeting point between savagery and civilization. Much has been written about the frontier from the point of view of border warfare and the chase, but as a field for the serious study of the economist and the historian it has been neglected.

The American frontier is sharply distinguished from the European frontier—a fortified boundary line running through dense populations. The most significant thing about the American frontier is, that it lies at the hither edge of free land. In the census reports it is treated as the margin of that settlement which has a density of two or more to the square mile. The term is an elastic one, and for our purposes does not need sharp definition. We shall consider the whole frontier belt, including the Indian country and the outer margin of the "settled area" of the census reports. This paper will make no attempt to treat the subject exhaustively; its aim is simply to call at-

¹ Abridgment of Debates, v., p. 706.

tention to the frontier as a fertile field for investigation, and to suggest some of the problems which arise in connection with it.

In the settlement of America we have to observe how European life entered the continent, and how America modified and developed that life, and reacted on Europe. Our early history is the history of European germs developing in an American environment. Too exclusive attention has been paid by institutional students to the Germanic origins, too little to the American factors. The frontier is the line of most rapid and effective Americanization. The wilderness masters the colonist. It finds him a European in dress, industries, tools, modes of travel, and thought. It takes him from the railroad car and puts him in the birch canoe. It strips off the garments of civilization, and arrays him in the hunting shirt and the moccasin. It puts him in the log cabin of the Cherokee and Iroquois and runs an Indian palisade around him. Before long he has gone to planting Indian corn and plowing with a sharp stick; he shouts the war cry and takes the scalp in orthodox Indian fashion. In short, at the frontier the environment is at first too strong for the man. He must accept the conditions which it furnishes, or perish, and so he fits himself into the Indian clearings and follows the Indian trails. Little by little he transforms the wilderness, but the outcome is not the old Europe, not simply the development of Germanic germs, any more than the first phenomenon was a case of reversion to the Germanic mark. The fact is, that here is a new product that is American. At first, the frontier was the Atlantic coast. It was the frontier of Europe in a very real sense. Moving westward, the frontier became more and more American. As successive terminal moraines result from successive glaciations, so each frontier leaves its traces behind it, and when it becomes a settled area the region still partakes of the frontier characteristics. Thus the advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, a steady growth of independence on American lines. And to study this advance, the men who grew up under these conditions, and the political, economic, and social results of it, is to study the peculiarly American part of our history.

STAGES OF FRONTIER ADVANCE.

In the course of the seventeenth century the frontier was advanced up the Atlantic river courses, just beyond the "fall line," and the tidewater region became the settled area. In the first half of the eighteenth century another advance occurred. Traders followed the Delaware and Shawnese Indians to the Ohio as

early as the end of the first quarter of the century.¹ Gov. Spotswood, of Virginia, made an expedition in 1714 across the Blue Ridge. The end of the first quarter of the century saw the advance of the Scotch-Irish and the Palatine Germans up the Shenandoah Valley into the western part of Virginia, and along the Piedmont region of the Carolinas.² The Germans in New York pushed the frontier of settlement up the Mohawk to German Flats.³ In Pennsylvania the town of Bedford indicates the line of settlement. Settlements had begun on New River, a branch of the Kanawha, and on the sources of the Yadkin and French Broad.⁴ The King attempted to arrest the advance by his proclamation of 1763,⁵ forbidding settlements beyond the sources of the rivers flowing into the Atlantic; but in vain. In the period of the Revolution the frontier crossed the Alleghanies into Kentucky and Tennessee, and the upper waters of the Ohio were settled.⁶ When the first census was taken in 1790, the continuous settled area was bounded by a line which ran near the coast of Maine, and included New England except a portion of Vermont and New Hampshire, New York along the Hudson and up the Mohawk about Schenectady, eastern and southern Pennsylvania, Virginia well across the Shenandoah Valley, and the Carolinas and eastern Georgia.⁷ Beyond this region of continuous settlement were the small settled areas of Kentucky and Tennessee, and the Ohio, with the mountains intervening between them and the Atlantic area, thus giving a new and important character to the frontier. The isolation of the region increased its peculiarly American tendencies, and the need of transportation facilities to connect it with the East called out important schemes of internal improvement, which will be noted farther on. The "West," as a self conscious section, began to evolve.

¹ Bancroft (1860 ed.), iii., pp. 344, 345, citing Logan MSS.; [Mitchell] *Contest in America*, etc. (1752), p. 237.

² Kercheval, *History of the Valley*; Bernheim, *German Settlements in the Carolinas*; Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, v., p. 304; Colonial Records of North Carolina, iv., p. xx.; Weston, *Documents Connected with the History of South Carolina*, p. 82; Ellis and Evans, *History of Lancaster County, Pa.*, chs. iii., xxxvi.

³ Parkman, *Pontiac*, ii.; Griffis, *Sir William Johnson*, p. 6; Simms's *Frontiersmen of New York*.

⁴ Monette, *Mississippi Valley*, i., p. 311.

⁵ *Wis. Hist. Colls.*, xi., p. 50; Hinsdale, *Old Northwest*, p. 121; Burke, "Oration on Conciliation," *Works* (1872 ed.), i., p. 473.

⁶ Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, and citations there given; Cutler's *Life of Cutler*. Scribner's *Statistical Atlas*, xxxviii., plate 13; McMaster, *Hist. of People of U. S.*, i., pp. 4, 60, 61; Imlay and Filson, *Western Territory of America* (London, 1793); Rochefoucault-Liancourt, *Travels Through the United States of North America* (London, 1799); Michaux's "Journal," in *Proceedings American Philosophical Society*, xxvi., No. 129; Forman, *Narrative of a Journey Down the Ohio and Mississippi in 1780-90* (Cincinnati, 1888); Bartram, *Travels Through North Carolina*, etc. (London, 1792); Pope, *Tour Through the Southern and Western Territories*, etc. (Richmond, 1792); Weld, *Travels Through the State of North America* (London, 1799); Baily, *Journal of a Tour in the Unsettled States of North America, 1796-97* (London, 1856); *Pennsylvania Magazine of History*, July, 1886; Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, vii., pp. 491, 492, citations.

From decade to decade distinct advances of the frontier occurred. By the census of 1820¹ the settled area included Ohio, southern Indiana and Illinois, southeastern Missouri, and about one-half of Louisiana. This settled area had surrounded Indian areas, and the management of these tribes became an object of political concern. The frontier region of the time lay along the Great Lakes, where Astor's American Fur Company operated in the Indian trade,² and beyond the Mississippi, where Indian traders extended their activity even to the Rocky Mountains; Florida also furnished frontier conditions. The Mississippi river region was the scene of typical frontier settlements.³

The rising steam navigation⁴ on western waters, the opening of the Erie canal, and the westward extension of cotton culture⁵ added five frontier states to the Union in this period. Grund, writing in 1836, declares: "It appears then that the universal disposition of Americans to emigrate to the western wilderness, in order to enlarge their dominion over inanimate nature, is the actual result of an expansive power which is inherent in them, and which by continually agitating all classes of society is constantly throwing a large portion of the whole population on the extreme confines of the state, in order to gain space for its development. Hardly is a new state or territory formed before the same principle manifests itself again and gives rise to a further emigration; and so is it destined to go on until a physical barrier must finally obstruct its progress."⁶

In the middle of this century the line indicated by the present eastern boundary of Indian Territory, Nebraska, and Kansas, marked the frontier of the Indian country.⁷ Minnesota and

¹Scribner's Statistical Atlas, xxxix.

²Turner, Character and Influence of the Indian Trade in Wisconsin, (Johns Hopkins University Studies, Series ix.), pp. 61 ff.

³Monette, History of the Mississippi Valley, ii.; Flint, Travels and Residence in Mississippi; Flint, Geography and History of the Western States; Abridgment of Debates of Congress, vii., pp. 397, 398, 404; Holmes, Account of the U. S.; Kingdom, America and the British Colonies (London, 1820); Grund, Americans, ii., chs. i., iii., vi. (although writing in 1836, he treats of conditions that grew out of western advance from the era of 1820 to that time); Peck, Guide for Emigrants (Boston, 1831); Darby, Emigrants' Guide to Western and Southwestern States and Territories; Dana, Geographical Sketches in the Western Country; Kinzie, Waubun; Keating, Narrative of Long's Expedition; Schoolcraft, Discovery of the Sources of the Mississippi River, Travels in the Central Portions of the Mississippi Valley, and Lead Mines of the Missouri; Andreas, History of Illinois, i., 86-99; Hurlbut, Chicago Antiquities; McKenney, Tour to the Lakes; Thomas, Travels Through the Western Country, etc. (Auburn, N. Y., 1819).

⁴Darby, Emigrants' Guide, pp. 272 ff.; Benton, Abridgment of Debates, vii., p. 397.

⁵DeBow's Review, iv., p. 254; xvii., p. 428.

⁶Grund, Americans, ii., p. 8.

⁷Peck, New Guide to the West (Cincinnati, 1848), ch. iv.; Parkman, Oregon Trail; Hall, The West (Cincinnati, 1848); Pierce, Incidents of Western Travel; Murray, Travels in North America; Lloyd, Steamboat Directory (Cincinnati, 1856); "Forty Days in a Western Hotel" (Chicago). In Putnam's Magazine, December, 1894; Mackay, The Western World, ii., ch. ii., iii.; Meeker, Life in the West; Bogen, German in America (Boston, 1851); Olmstead, Texas Journey; Greeley, Recollections of a Busy Life; Schouler, History of United States, v., 261-267; Peyton, Over the Alleghanies and Across the Prairies (London, 1870); Peyton, Suggestions on Railroad Communication with the Pacific, and the Trade of China and the Indian Islands; Benton, Highway to the Pacific (a speech in the U. S. Senate, Dec. 16, 1850).

Wisconsin still exhibited frontier conditions,¹ but the distinctive frontier of the period is found in California, where the gold discoveries had sent a sudden tide of adventurous miners, and in Oregon, and the settlements in Utah. As the frontier had leaped over the Alleghanies, so now it skipped the Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains; and in the same way that the advance of the frontiersmen beyond the Alleghanies had caused the rise of important questions of transportation and internal improvement, so now the settlers beyond the Rocky Mountains needed means of communication with the East, and in the furnishing of these arose the settlement of the Great Plains and the development of still another kind of frontier life. Railroads, fostered by land grants, sent an increasing tide of immigrants into the far West. The United States Army² fought a series of Indian wars in Minnesota, Dakota, and the Indian Territory; cessions made way for settlement.

By 1880 the settled area had been pushed into northern Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, along Dakota rivers, and in the Black Hills region, and was ascending the rivers of Kansas and Nebraska. The development of mines in Colorado had drawn isolated frontier settlements into that region, and Montana and Idaho were receiving settlers. The frontier was found in these mining camps and the ranches of the Great Plains. The superintendent of the census for 1890 reports, as previously stated, that the settlements of the West lie so scattered over the region, that there can no longer be said to be a frontier line.

In these successive frontiers we find natural boundary lines which have served to mark and to affect the characteristics of the frontiers, namely: The "fall line;" the Alleghany Mountains; the Mississippi; the Missouri, where its direction approximates north and south; the line of the arid lands, approximately the 99th meridian; and the Rocky Mountains. The fall line marked the frontier of the seventeenth century; the Alleghanies that of the eighteenth; the Mississippi that of the first quarter of the nineteenth; the Missouri that of the middle of this century (omitting the California movement); and the belt of the Rocky Mountains and the arid tract, the present frontier. Each was won by a series of Indian wars.

¹ A writer in *The Home Missionary* (1850), p. 239, reporting Wisconsin conditions, exclaims: "Think of this, people of the enlightened East. What an example, to come from the very frontiers of civilization!" But one of the missionaries writes: "In a few years Wisconsin will no longer be considered as the West, or as an outpost of civilization, any more than Western New York, or the Western Reserve."

² Bancroft (H. H.), *History of California, History of Oregon, and Popular Tribunals; Shinn, Mining Camps.*

³ Rodenbough and Haskins, *Army of the United States.*

See *Atlantic Monthly*, lxxix., p. 410.

THE FRONTIER FURNISHES A FIELD FOR COMPARATIVE STUDY OF
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT.

At the Atlantic frontier one can study the germs of processes repeated at each successive frontier. We have the complex European life sharply precipitated by the wilderness into the simplicity of primitive conditions. The first frontier had to meet its Indian question, its question of the disposition of the public domain, of the means of intercourse with older settlements, of the extension of political organization, of religious and educational activity. And the settlement of these and similar questions for one frontier served as a guide for the next. The American student needs not to go to the "prim little townships of Sleswick" for illustrations of the law of continuity and development. For example, he may study the origin of our land policies in the colonial land policy; he may see how the system grew by adapting the statutes to the customs of the successive frontiers.¹ He may see how the mining experience in the lead region of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Iowa was applied to the mining laws of the Rockies,² and how our Indian policy has been a series of experimentations on successive frontiers. Each tier of new states has found in the older ones material for its constitutions.³ Each frontier has made similar contributions to American character, as will be discussed farther on.

But with all these similarities there are essential differences, due to the place element and the time element. It is evident that the farming frontier of the Mississippi Valley presents different conditions from the mining frontier of the Rocky Mountains. The frontier reached by the Pacific railroad, surveyed into rectangles, guarded by the United States Army, and recruited by the daily immigrant ship, moves forward in a different way and at a swifter pace than the frontier reached by the birch canoe or the pack horse. The geologist traces patiently the shores of ancient seas, maps their areas, and compares the older and the newer. It would be a work worth the historian's labors to mark these various frontiers, and in detail compare one with another. Not only would there result a more adequate conception of American development and characteristics, but invaluable additions would be made to the history of society.

Loria,⁴ the Italian economist, has urged the study of colonial life as an aid in understanding the stages of European develop-

¹ See the suggestive paper by Prof. Jesse Macy, *The Institutional Beginnings of a Western State*.

² *Shinn, Mining Camps*.

³ Compare Thorpe, in *Annals American Academy of Political and Social Science*, September, 1891; Bryce, *American Commonwealth* (1888) ii., p. 680.

⁴ Loria, *Analisi della Proprieta Capitalista*, ii., p. 15.

ment, affirming that colonial settlement is for economic science what the mountain is for geology, bringing to light primitive stratifications. "America," he says, "has the key to the historical enigma which Europe has sought for centuries in vain, and the land which has no history reveals luminously the course of universal history." There is much truth in this. The United States lies like a huge page in the history of society. Line by line as we read this continental page from west to east we find the record of social evolution. It begins with the Indian and the hunter; it goes on to tell of the disintegration of savagery by the entrance of the trader, the path-finder of civilization; we read the annals of the pastoral stage in ranch life; the exploitation of the soil by the raising of unrotated crops of corn and wheat in sparsely settled farming communities; the intensive culture of the denser farm settlement; and finally, the manufacturing organization with city and factory system.¹ This page is familiar to the student of census statistics, but how little of it has been used by our historians. Each of these areas has had an influence in our economic and political history; the evolution of each into a higher stage has worked political transformations. But what constitutional historian has made any adequate attempt to interpret political facts by the light of these social areas and changes?

The Atlantic frontier was compounded of fisherman, fur trader, miner, cattle raiser and farmer. Excepting the fisherman, each type of industry was on the march toward the West, drawn by an irresistible attraction. Each passed in successive waves across the continent. Stand at Cumberland Gap and watch the procession of civilization, marching single file—the buffalo following the trail to the salt springs, the Indian, the fur trader and hunter, the cattle raiser, the pioneer farmer,—and the frontier has passed by. Stand at South Pass in the Rockies a century later, and see the same procession with wider intervals between. The unequal rate of advance compels us to distinguish the frontier into the trader's frontier, the rancher's frontier, or the miner's frontier, and the farmer's frontier. When the mines and the cowpens were still near the fall line the traders' pack trains were tinkling across the Alleghanies, and the French on the Great Lakes were fortifying their posts, alarmed by the British trader's birch canoe. When the trappers scaled the Rockies, the farmer was still near the mouth of the Missouri.

¹ Compare *Observations on the North American Land Company*, London, 1796, pp. 15, 144; Logan, *History of Upper South Carolina*, i., pp. 149-151; Turner, *Character and Influence of Indian Trade in Wisconsin*, p. 18; Peck, *New Guide for Emigrants* (Boston, 1837), ch. iv.; *Compendium Eleventh Census*, i., p. xl.

West. On the other hand, the contest for power and the expansive tendency, furnished to the various sects by the existence of a moving frontier, must have had important results on the character of religious organization in the United States. It is a chapter in our history which needs study.

INTELLECTUAL TRAITS.

From the conditions of frontier life came intellectual traits of profound importance. The works of travelers along each frontier from colonial days onward describe certain common traits, and these traits have, while softening down, still persisted as survivals in the place of their origin, even when a higher social organization succeeded. The result is that to the frontier the American intellect owes its striking characteristics. That coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and inquisitiveness; that practical, inventive turn of mind, quick to find expedients; that masterful grasp of material things, lacking in the artistic, but powerful to effect great ends; that restless, nervous energy,¹ that dominant individualism, working for good and for evil, and withal, that buoyancy and exuberance which comes with freedom—these are traits of the frontier, or traits called out elsewhere because of the existence of the frontier. Since the days when the fleet of Columbus sailed into the waters of the New World, America has been another name for opportunity, and the people of the United States have taken their tone from the incessant expansion which has not only been open, but has even been forced upon them. He would be a rash prophet who should assert that the expansive character of American life has now entirely ceased. Movement has been its dominant fact, and, unless this training has no effect upon a people, the American energy will continually demand a wider field for its exercise.² But never again will such gifts of free land offer themselves. For a moment, at the frontier, the bonds of custom are broken, and unrestraint is triumphant. There is not *tabula rasa*. The stubborn American environment is there with its imperious summons to accept its conditions; the inherited ways of doing things are also there; and yet, in spite of environment, and in spite of custom, each frontier did indeed furnish a new field of oppor-

¹ Colonial travellers agree in remarking on the phlegmatic characteristics of the colonists. It has frequently been asked how such a people could have developed that strained nervous energy now characteristic of them. Compare Sumner, *Alexander Hamilton*, p. 98, and Adams, *History of the United States*, i., p. 60; ix., pp. 240, 241. The transition appears to become marked at the close of the War of 1812, a period when interest centered upon the development of the West, and the West was noted for restless energy. Grund, *Americans*, ii., ch. i.

²The commentary upon this sentence—written in 1893—lies in the recent history of Hawaii, Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines, and the Isthmian Canal.

tunity, a gate of escape from the bondage of the past; and freshness, and confidence, and scorn of older society, impatience of its restraints and its ideas, and indifference to its lessons, have accompanied the frontier. What the Mediterranean Sea was to the Greeks, breaking the bond of custom, offering new experiences, calling out new institutions and activities, that, and more, the ever retreating frontier has been to the United States directly, and to the nations of Europe more remotely. And now, four centuries from the discovery of America, at the end of a hundred years of life under the Constitution, the frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American history.

FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D.

University of Wisconsin

Poets of the Social Revolution.

SOMEONE has said something to the effect that when any great movement begins to have its poets it is not so very far from victory. It is certainly a sign that it is becoming a very vital part of the race life of the age in which it exists. Socialism has from the very beginning been an inspirer of poets and can count a long list who have sung its purpose and its mission. Three volumes have recently appeared filled with the work of men who have attuned their music to the harmony of the social revolution.*

All three show the influence of Whitman. In form and matter they must be counted as followers of this great rude, rough singer of America. Neither, I think, will any of them complain, if we say that they have fallen much behind the master. There has been but the one Whitman, and I wonder if he ever dreamed of founding a "school." Perhaps Horace Traubel may object to his book being called poetry, but if the work of the others is to be so classified then his must claim the same name. The mere fact that he is more prodigal with periods, and less free with paragraphs than the other two is something the proofreader might easily have remedied. I am not sure but what some such changes might have been an improvement in some instances that might be cited from all three readers. All write largely in the same prophetic, ecstatic tones so characteristic of Whitman. All pay the highest possible homage to conventionality, by their conscious straining to avoid it, something in which they are in no way peculiar at the present time.

Traubel is staccato in style, assertive rather than argumentative, prophetic rather than explanatory. The following extract is one of his best:

"If it were not for the boys, or for the boy left over in the man, everything would remain about where it is. We draw a line up against which we halt the boy. The boy walks straight-way over. He does not defy us. He does not hear us. The boy has eye and ear for sights and sounds ahead. But no cries from the past arrest his impatient feet. Every boy brings the youth of the race back again. The hope you have lost your boy recovers. When you say rebellion you say boy. The boy is not a blank wall. He is an open way. You get rid of the boy at

*"CHANTS COMMUNAL," by Horace Traubel. Small, Maynard & Co. Cloth, 194 pp.

"BROAD CAST", by Ernest Crosby, Funk & Wagnalls Co., Cloth, 126 pp., 75c.

"THE VOICE OF EQUALITY," by Edwin Arnold Brenholtz. Richard G. Badger. Cloth. 107 pp.

your peril. You cannot save yourself. The boy can save you. You can go to bed heavy with sleep. He will dream for you. You can go down town and trade swindle for swindle in the greed of the world. He will study and play and be honest for you. The born striker, the boy. Have you ever built a wall so high some boy could not climb it? Have you ever cried a no so deep some boy could not spade below it? Have you ever taught any religion, or any philanthropy, so good some boy could not better it? The rebellion of the boy is the salvation of the man."

Ernest Crosby dedicates his "Broadcast" to Edward Carpenter, another member of the Whitman clan. He opens his work with a defiance to institutions.

"I saw laws and customs and creeds and Bibles rising like emanations from men and women.

I saw the men and women bowing down and worshipping these cloudy shapes, and I saw the shapes turn upon them and rend them.

Nay, but men and women are the supreme facts."

We would recommend the following for a motto for a Civic Federation temple:

"Peace between capital and labor, is that all that you ask?

Is peace then the only thing needful?

There was peace enough in southern slavery.

There is a peace of life and another peace of death.

It is well to rise above violence.

It is well to rise superior to anger.

But if peace means final acquiescence in wrong, if your aim is less than justice and peace, forever one—then your peace is a crime."

There is a keen insight and a beautiful thought in this extract from the poem on "Democracy:—"

"The common people—why *common* people?

Does it not mean common life, common aspirations, community of interests, communion of man with man?

Does it not imply the spirit of communism, of fellowship, of brotherhood?

Does it not suggest that human life down at the bottom is more fluid and intermingled and social than up at the top?

Is not all this hidden away in the words 'common people'?"

Sometimes he drops into conventional rhyme and rhythm, in a few cases with success, in one or two with a distinct weakening. In "Spring Thoughts" he has something that is daintily beautiful and instinct with the spirit of poetry at every point. The same is true of some of his "Country Pictures," that, while written in Whitman form, without regular versification, carries the reader

along with a swing as compelling as a marching song. As for his philosophy, it is protesting, rebellious, suggestive, and destructive, rather than inspiringly constructive.

The work of Comrade Brenholtz is so well known to readers of the REVIEW that we shall not give any quotations from his "Voice of Equality." His muse is more in tune with the song of Socialism than either of the others. I believe, too, that, while there are times in which his work limps badly, and is really only good prose (though just why we should say "*only*" I do not know), there are other "purple spots" that touch a higher mark than anything that has been done by any of the many followers of the new form of prosody.

On the whole, however, the impression which is given by the poets of Socialism who have appeared thus far, is one of promise rather than achievement. If we except Morris and Whitman, the singers of the new social order have not yet gained a place in the world's literature. This does not say that there is not strength and beauty in the lines of these writers. There is plenty of both, and taken as a whole they certainly rank as high from any literary point of view as any of those of the present day whom capitalism delights to honor.

A. M. SIMONS.

The Labor Theory of Value in the Light of Recent Criticism.

Continued from November.

Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* opens with the following passage: "The annual labor of *every* nation is the fund which originally supplies it with *all* the necessities and conveniences of life which it annually consumes, and which consist *always* either in the immediate produce of that labor, or in what is purchased with that produce from other nations."

The opening passage of Ricardo's *Principles* reads as follows: "The produce of the earth,—all that is derived from its surface by the united application of labor, machinery and capital, is divided among three classes of the community, namely, the proprietor of the land, the owner of the stock or capital necessary for its cultivation, and the laborers by whose industry it is cultivated. But in different stages of society, the proportions of the whole produce of the earth which will be allotted to each of these classes, under the names of rent, profit, and wages, will be essentially different, depending mainly on the actual fertility of the soil, on the accumulation of capital and population, and on the skill, ingenuity and instruments employed in agriculture."

Jevons, the English head of the "Austrian" school, opens his book on the principles of political economy with the following words:—"The science of political economy rests upon a few *notions* of an apparently simple character. Utility, wealth, value, commodity, labor, land, capital, are the elements of the subject; and whoever has a thorough comprehension of their nature must possess or be soon able to acquire a knowledge of the whole science. As almost every economical writer has remarked, it is in treating the simple elements that we require the most care and precaution, since the least error of *conception* must vitiate all our *deductions*. Accordingly, I have devoted the following pages to an investigation of the conditions and relations of the above-named *notions*."

And the opening passage of Böhm-Bawerck's own book on capital reads:—"He who possesses a capital is as a rule in a position to derive from it a continued net income, which income is known to science under the head of Rent of Capital or Interest of Capital in the broader sense of the term. This income possesses certain remarkable qualities. It arises independent of any personal activity of the capitalist,—it comes to him even though

he never raised a finger to create it, and seems therefore most truly to flow from, or according to an ancient simile, to be generated by capital."

All of these great luminaries of the science seem to be ready to lay down general laws governing human society, without regard to time and place. They all seem to be oblivious of the fact that the laws which they are about to explain have no universal application and are limited to a certain form of society, far from being universal in space, and further still from being perpetual in time. Not one of them seems to have given the slightest thought to the fact that the phenomena which he was about to describe and examine were part of a certain historical situation and the result of a certain historical development. History, with its actual, real facts and relations does not exist for them. All the nations, all the ages, and all stages of human development are subject to the laws which they lay down. To one of them, and that one the great "modern" Jevons, one of the great triumvirate of the "modern" school,—Jevons,—Menger,—Böhm-Bawerck,—the laws of political economy are not only extra-historic but extra everything else that has a semblance of reality, and reduce themselves to a few purely logical "notions," a correct "conception" of which gives one the key to the science of political economy quite irrespective of the knowledge of the facts of life, which seem to be an entirely negligible quantity to our great "modern" scientist.

Contrast with all this the opening sentence of Marx's *Kapital*:—"The wealth of those societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails presents itself as an immense accumulation of commodities." With one mighty stroke of the pen all the conditions and limitations of the problem are given, the picture put in its historical setting! No soaring in the air, superior to space and time. No generalizations that may fit everything in general and nothing in particular. But a real, live situation, with a definite burning problem. No wonder that instead of losing himself in generalities or wasting himself on definitions of all sorts of "conceptions" and "notions," he delves right into the heart of the problem, and declares immediately that "our investigation must therefore begin with the analysis of a commodity." This he immediately proceeds to do. And how he does it!

To be sure, he does not do it to the entire satisfaction of his critics, but we shall see that this is due mainly to failure on their part to understand his work, as in the claim of Böhm-Bawerck about the supposed purely logical argument employed by Marx. Where these critics do understand Marx, their dis-

satisfaction with his argument is due to their lack of knowledge of the subject itself.

Slonimski, for instance, objects to Marx's analysis for the reason that in this analysis "the conception of labor becomes independent of the purposes and necessities for which it was undertaken," and the value created by labor "becomes an independent quality inherent in the commodity irrespective of its usefulness and exchange-value." Aside from the evidently absurd statement that according to Marx the *exchange-value* of a commodity is inherent in the commodity irrespective of its *exchange-value*, (Marx knows of only two kinds of value: use-value and exchange-value, and wherever he says simply "value" he means exchange-value), the statement contains some important inaccuracies.

To begin with, Marx never forgets the "purposes and necessities" for which production is undertaken. Quite the reverse: this thought is ever present in his mind, and it is due to this very fact that Marx did not fall into some of the grievous errors into which his critics, particularly the "moderns," have fallen. These gentlemen talk of the "psychological" motives of exchange as the cause and measure of value, all the time forgetting that before a commodity can be exchanged it must be *produced*, and that there must therefore be, first of all, "psychological" motives of *production* which ought to be of quite some interest. Not so with Marx. He always remembers that in our capitalistic system, (Be it remembered: Unlike his critics, Marx never talks of eternity but of the present capitalistic system) production is undertaken for the *purpose* of *profit*. This implies two things: First, that the producer *does not* produce the thing for its use-value, he does not give a snap for that, it is absolutely *useless* to him, and he will just as soon manufacture chewing-gum as Bibles.—And, second, that he knows in advance, or at least thinks he knows, the value of the product he is going to produce; in other words, he knows that the value of his product will depend on something more substantial and rational than the whimsical "desire" of the prospective purchaser based on some individual, "psychological" motivation. And this knowledge on the part of Marx of the *purposes* of capitalistic production had something to do with his abstracting from the useful qualities of the particular commodities when examining their exchange-value, as well as with his refusal to follow Böhm-Bawerck's advice to arrive at the laws of exchange-value by way of an examination of the "psychological" motives of exchange.

It is also somewhat inaccurate to say that according to Marx, exchange-value is *inherent* in a commodity, or that it is independent of its usefulness. Marx, as we have already seen, spe-

cifically says that exchange-value is not something inherent in a commodity, that it could not be inherent in it for it changes with social relations; that the whole thing is merely the expression of a social relation and appears only under a certain social system. Marx also says specifically, as also already stated, that no commodity can have exchange-value without its having use-value, that use-value is the substratum of exchange-value although it is neither its cause nor its measure. But then, Marx contradicts himself! Poor Marx! he contradicts himself so much and so radically that one is forced to the conclusion that he must have been a raving maniac, and one is surprised to see the big regiment of these very learned and clever gentlemen bothering the scribblings of this poor wretch.

Böhm-Bawerck, who thinks that Marx's was one of the greatest minds that applied themselves to this subject, also finds great comfort in Marx's supposed neglect of *usefulness* as influencing the exchange-value of commodities. He does not say that Marx contradicts himself, but he thinks that he caught Marx in a mental *four pas*. Indeed, this is one of the greatest, if not the chief point, in his whole argument against Marx's analysis of a commodity, by which he arrives, at his labor theory of value. Marx says:

"The exchange-values of commodities must be capable of being expressed in terms of something common to them all, of which thing they represent a greater or less quantity. This common "something" can not be either a geometrical, a chemical, or any other natural property of commodities. Such properties claim our attention only in so far as they affect the utility of these commodities, make them use-values. But the exchange of commodities is evidently an act characterized by a total abstraction from use-value. Then one use-value is just as good as another, provided, only, it be present in sufficient *quantity*. As use-values, commodities are, above all, of different qualities, but as exchange-values they are merely different quantities and consequently do not contain an atom of use-value. If, then, we leave out of consideration the use-value of commodities, they have only one common property left, that of being products of labor. But even the product of labor itself has undergone a change in our hands. If we make abstraction from its use-value we make abstraction at the same time from the material elements and shapes that make the product a use-value; we see in it no longer a table, a house, yarn, or any other useful thing. Its existence as a material thing is put out of sight. Neither can it any longer be regarded as the product of the labor of the joiner, the mason, the spinner, or of any other definite kind of productive labor. Along with the useful qualities of the products themselves, we

put out of sight both the useful character of the various kinds of labor embodied in them, and the concrete forms of that labor, there is nothing left but what is common to them all; all are reduced to one and the same sort of labor, human labor in the abstract."

To which Böhm-Bawerck: "How is that? Where is the difference between labor and utility? While it is true that in the exchange relation of commodities the particularly useful qualities of the articles exchanged does not matter, the general *usefulness* of the commodities is not abstracted from. On the contrary, it remains common to them all. It does not matter whether the commodity can be used as an eatable, wearing-apparel, or for shelter, but it does matter that it be of some use, of use in general. Why, then, is utility rejected as a cause and measure of exchange-value, what is it "abstracted" from? Again, when considering labor Marx is compelled to abstract from the particular kind of labor contained in the commodity, so that what is left to all commodities in common is general labor, labor in the abstract. Just as there still remains in common to all of them general usefulness, usefulness in the abstract. Why then, this partiality for labor as against usefulness? Where is the reason for the discrimination in favor of the one as against the other, which makes the one the sole cause and measure of value, and denies to the other any influence whatever on this phenomenon?" And all this with such an amount of emphasis, that if it depended on that alone, the whole Marxian theoretical edifice would be smashed to pieces, which Böhm-Bawerck naively imagines that he does.

We do not presume to know whether Marx was ever embarrassed by these questions. But we venture to say that if he ever were, and all the resources of logic failed him, he had only to turn to the *purposes* of capitalistic production to be relieved of any difficulty. Slonimski touched a sore spot of anti-Marxism when he broached the subject of *purposes* of production, which his more discreet colleagues usually pass in silence. We have already dwelt on the subject at some length, but it is of such paramount importance that we cannot dwell upon it too much or recur to it too often.

Before commodities are exchanged, they are produced. They are produced, however, with a view to their exchange, and to the value to be realized on such exchange, and in the exchange itself the question of how, and in what manner the commodity was produced has a good deal to do with the fixing of its value. It is not, however, the question of the usefulness of the production that is considered. We have already mentioned that a capitalist will just as soon manufacture chewing gum as Holy Bibles. But more than that. The *purposes* of the production of commodi-

ties being the realization of a *profit*, a capitalist will just as willingly manufacture an *absolutely useless* article, if he will be assured of a profit. He does not manufacture absolutely useless things, because in order to get a purchaser it must be of some use to somebody, but he personally *does not* care a rap whether it really is useful or not. Again, when the article is of some use to somebody, that is, salable, he does not care a bit about anything that goes to make it useful. This is absolutely indifferent to him. He will manufacture any shape, color, taste or other quality, and when he comes to exchange it,—sell it,—he will not be concerned a bit whether the commodity he produced and is about to exchange is white, black, orange, or any other color; whether it is square, round, pointed or any other shape; sweet, sour, fragrant or otherwise; hard or soft, or whether it possesses any other quality which may determine its particular usefulness. But he *will* care how much labor it contains! This can readily be seen in our “advanced” methods of doing business when goods are “ordered,” that is sold—exchanged—before they are produced. In making the sale-exchange the producer will comply with any request as to shape, color, taste, or any other natural quality which affects the usefulness of the commodity with alacrity, as it is a matter of complete indifference to him. But he will stand out against anything that will require him to put into the commodity more labor. In taking your order,—exchanging *in prospecto* his goods for yours—he will “abstract” from any and all natural qualities upon which the usefulness of the commodity depends, but he will absolutely refuse to “abstract” from labor, and will doggedly insist on considering it when making valuations. Further, he will gladly “abstract” from the *kind* of labor. If he is willing to give you for a certain price the labor of, say, one hundred men for ten days, he will just as soon give you the product of the labors of tailors as of shoemakers. But he will make a stand on the question of the *quantity* of labor. He wouldn’t give you any *more* than he can help.

These actual “experiences” of the exchange relation which we have recounted are perfectly represented in Marx’s “logical” analysis, with which Böhm-Bawerck finds fault. It is true that as regards both, labor and usefulness, we “abstract” in the exchange relation from the particular, the particular labor and the particular usefulness, and leave only the general labor and the general usefulness. But in abstracting from the particular utility we have abstracted from the *quality* of the utility and have shown the exchange-relation to be a purely *quantitative relation*. But general usefulness cannot be *measured* as to *quantity*. It is hard to measure qualities unless they are of the same kind. But it is absolutely impossible to measure the general, abstract usefulness

of different things. How do you find the different amount of usefulness contained in a piano as compared with a suit of clothes, of an extension-table as compared with an engine-boiler? How do you measure general usefulness? If you cannot measure it, it cannot serve as a *measure* of value. And if it cannot serve as a *measure* of value, it cannot be the *cause* of value, for we judge the cause of value from the *changes* in value as shown by the measure of value. We find the very *existence* of value only because of its *measure*. Besides, the residuum of general usefulness which remains after we abstract from the particular useful qualities, is *not general* usefulness to the parties concerned in the exchange, and who fix the exchange-value, but general usefulness to *somebody*, that is, to *society* at large. For the parties exchanging the commodity it has *no use-value whatsoever*.

No so with labor. When we abstract from the particular labor contained in the commodity we abstract only from the *kind* of labor, that is, from its *quality*, but not from its *quantity*. *And it is just the quantity that we want, as the exchange of commodities is a quantitative relation.* And this quantitative relation of labor exists for these very people who enter the exchange relation. Abstract, general, human labor can be measured quantitatively and quantitatively only. That is why Marx's analysis is perfect. Abstract human labor, irrespective of the particular qualities of the labor employed to produce this commodity, abstract human labor, whose only measure is *time*, is the cause and *measure* of exchange-value.

Marx, however, never rests his case on a purely logical argument. Logic is to him only an instrument to the proper analysis and understanding of the actual facts of "experience." We have seen that, as a "logical" proposition, usefulness is entirely eliminated from value. But we have seen from our examination of the "experiences" of the exchange relation that there is some residuum of usefulness, general usefulness to society, which plays some role in it. We have seen both as a matter of logic and of experience that it is not, nor could it be, either the cause or the measure of value. What, then, is its role? True to himself he would not leave any actual fact unaccounted for. It is absolutely untrue that Marx disregards usefulness as a factor of value. Notwithstanding the fact, that this is assumed by every critic of the Marxian theory of value, it is absolutely and unqualifiedly untrue, and is only one additional link in the long chain of proof that an absolute lack of understanding of the Marxian doctrine seems to be the first qualification of a modern Marx-critic.

General, social usefulness has some influence on exchange-value. It is not its cause nor its measure. What is it? *It is its*

limitation. The facts of exchange, the "experiences" of the "exchange-relation," prove that general, social usefulness, the only usefulness which plays any part in the exchange of commodities under our capitalistic system, is neither the cause nor the measure of exchange-value, but its *limitation*. And this is borne out by Marx's very "logical" analysis, which so much aroused the ire and indignation of Böhm-Bawerck, that he almost forgot the respectful attitude which he usually assumes towards Marx. This result of experience and analysis is one of the main features of Marx's theory value, that feature which more than any other, stamps it as peculiarly his own. We have already seen, that according to Marx it is not *every* labor that creates value, but *socially necessary* labor. We have also seen already that Marx's conception of "socially necessary" includes the *general* as well as the *relative usefulness* of the commodity to society. That is why, according to the Marxian theory, the value of a commodity is not measured by the labor actually contained in a commodity, but the labor socially necessary to reproduce it. In the last article we have seen the historical basis of Marx's theoretical conclusions, now we see their logical and "experimental" justification.

Strange as it may seem, the very critics who are most vehement in the denunciation of Marx's so-called abstractions as unwarranted, and his supposed disregard of the "category" of usefulness as unpardonable, are at the same time raising an outcry against Marx for his insistence that only "socially necessary" labor is the cause and measure of value! With all their astuteness they cannot see the very simple fact that Marx *does* include usefulness as a factor of value, and that this very inclusion, which they loudly demand, accounts for the "socially necessary" which they no less loudly abjure! Indeed, none are so blind as those who will not see.

L. B. BOUDIN.

Studies in the History of the Development of the North American Proletariat.

(Continued.)

THE old great parties of America have well been compared to the giant trusts that control such great masses of capital, since they so exclusively dominate all fields of activity that all competing "third" parties appear to be completely excluded. If a competitor does appear the old parties will do anything to drive it away, if necessary they will unite for a short time in order to drive the venturous interloper out of their fields.

The history of "third" parties in America is therefore a mournful story of continuous defeats which leaves little hope for the future.

* * *

This tragical fate of all "third" parties has undoubtedly contributed to the difficulty of building up an independent party. It has brought "third" parties, as such, into discredit. Illustrations are drawn from the fate of the numerous "third" parties as reflections on the formation of new ones. The interest of the great parties is naturally most closely involved in building up an opinion to the effect that all "third" parties are "Utopian," ineffective, un-American, etc. The old parties thus draw new vitality from the mournful end of their competitors. This gives rise to one more obstacle to the evolution of an independent socialist party.

It must be admitted that the scientific reader will not find himself satisfied with this statement of the situation. Is it really only the external condition of party organization, he will ask, that up till the present time has prevented the appearance of a socialist movement in the United States. He also might well say: The reference to the fiasco following the formation of other parties is not sufficient proof, without something further. Have not all these parties possessed inherent weaknesses? Were they not all incapable of life because they lacked a clear view of any definite goal, and were not based upon a social body having uniform interests? Is not the socialist movement distinguished from all the movements which have been described, in that it possesses just these characteristics?

Cannot a party which actually follows a definite object and really serves a common interest of great masses finally succeed in

substituting itself for the old parties? The party history of the United States has indeed one important example of the fact that in extraordinary circumstances it is possible to break the monopoly of the "great parties" and to form a new party capable of living. This example is offered by that of the present Republican party which arose out of the agitation for the abolition of slavery and has been able to maintain the dominant position which it so quickly gained. To be sure the conditions of the time during which the Republican party arose were much more favorable for the development of third parties. Party discipline was not half so strong; especially in the West, where the new party first gained a footing. Party organization was everywhere very little developed. Indeed the whole carefully constructed "machine" has arisen since the Civil War and has been largely created by the Republican party.

At once the thought will arise that what was attained by one party under the rallying cry of "emancipation of the black slaves" is possible even amidst the great difficulties of to-day, with the much stronger and more comprehensive cries of "emancipation of the white slaves from the fetters of capitalism"—"emancipation of the proletariat." If it is really possible to unite broad sections of the working population on this programme, that is to awake their class-consciousness, then it appears to me that their triumphal procession could be prevented by no electoral machine, however complicated, or by ever so old or powerful a monopoly of the old parties.

If we are really to exhaust the reasons which up to the present time have retarded socialism in the United States we must carry our investigation into deeper strata, we must seek for more hidden causes. Yet I think that with a little consideration it is not so hard to find these. They lie in part (and for this reason they should be discussed in this relation) still on the political field. It is necessary that the political relation of the American union should be considered, not simply in their historical form, but also in their inner essence. To be sure the old parties possess their electoral monopoly to a large degree because they are large and because they are in possession of the machine. But their character also contributes to the maintenance of this monopoly. They are even to-day, because of all the historical grounds that I have discussed, the parties of the predominant portion of the proletariat. But they would not be this if they did not make it extremely easy for the wage worker, and even for the class conscious wage worker, to belong to them. Just how this is the case we shall now proceed to explain.

V

The American parties are always a riddle to the educated European. This is true even of the names. I remember the time

when I first took any interest in politics how difficult it was for me to distinguish between the two great parties. I knew nothing more of them than their names. Both of these names pleased me so well that the choice between them was difficult. In any other country I was sure to find a party with an acceptable name, such as the: "*Estrema Sinistra*," the "*Radicaux*," or the "*Extrême Gauche*" the "*Fortschritts partei*," or even the "*Freisinnige Volks Partei*." When I stood between the two designations of the American parties it was like the fabled donkey between the two bundles of hay. Democrat sounded just as nice as Republican. I could not discover in either the slightest indication of which was the more "radical" and to which therefore my sympathies would turn as a foreordained fact. I found that the Democrats could just as much be considered the "left" of the Republicans as the latter "left" from the former. This boyish position was perfectly natural. Even to the ripened judgment the opposition of these two names appears puzzling and even to those who understand the foundations of the two parties their official designation seems unfortunate. These names that the parties bear, not only indicate no antagonism, but not even a difference. They are absolutely meaningless.

Let us leave the names on one side for a moment and turn toward the platforms, in which, to be sure, even if we find no absolute antagonism, we must certainly discover a divergence on certain points. But there also expectations are destined to be destroyed. So far as any fundamental difference in principles or on the great question of politics are concerned there is no trace to be found in the two American parties.

Ordinarily it is claimed that they are distinguished with regard to their attitude to the federal government and the individual states. Republicans are said to favor centralization, the Democrats decentralization. It is very evident, however, that even this antagonism is much too historical and theoretical today to serve any purpose in practical politics. For years there has been no conflict between the national government and the individual states. If such a one were to arise it would be always questionable how the two parties would divide upon it. It is certain that they would take their position wholly with regard as to which position would give them the greatest strength and wholly independent of any previous position.

* * *

In all other political questions the antagonism between Republicans and Democrats is still smaller.

Some time ago the parties were for a short time in sharp antagonism in relation to the currency question. The Democrats strongly supported the interest of the silver mine owners and

took up the question of free coinage of silver. Today this question offers no means of distinguishing between Republicans and Democrats. So far as it still exists it is only a struggle within the ranks of the Democrats, as to which is the proper currency policy, there being both gold and silver democrats.

Occasionally it appears as if the Democrat party inclined more toward free trade, the Republican to high tariff, but it must not be forgotten that the Democrats came forward as supporters of free trade, at least so far as a lowering of a protective tariff was concerned, simply in opposition to the ruling Republican policy. If they had really had the power to decide, their free trade position would soon have suffered a weakening.

* * *

I think that the two great political parties in the United States can only be properly considered when we free ourselves from all the ideas arising from the relations of European political parties. This means that American parties must not be looked upon as groups of men who have united as supporters of a common political principle. They might have been this in their beginning. It was perhaps true that in the first decade of the Republic the representatives of a more centralizing tendency and those not inclined toward state rights were divided between Democrats and Republicans, and that the former of these held more closely to the ideal of "order" and the latter was more inclined toward "freedom," as is Bryce's opinion. However, this might have been, whatever might have been the principal antagonism which then existed; by 1820 they belong to the past. When in 1824 Van Buren organized the opposition against John Quincy Adams he was seeking only for a favorable battle ground. To be sure he found this in the defense of the alleged endangered "state rights," which, however, in reality were threatened by nobody.

He raised Jackson as his standard bearer and was a master in creating enthusiasm out of nothing for his man. Jackson appeared as a defender of the "sacred rights of the people." His opponents so far from denying the desirability of this position proceeded to immediately appropriate it themselves. Van Buren following Jackson in the presidential chair, found himself opposed by Harrison. Then it was that Harrison in turn was designated by his party followers as the "man of the people" in opposition to Van Buren, just as the latter had placed Jackson in opposition to Adams. Harrison was the "log cabin" candidate, who led a frugal, simple life, practicing all the virtues of the simple life; meanwhile Van Buren was said to live in a palace and eat with golden knives and forks.

This simply means that the grounds which had originally

given birth to the party had exhausted their activity. The *raison d'être* had disappeared, the party would consequently have dissolved if it had really been the defender of any definite political principle. It did not dissolve, however, thanks to its own inertia and its possibilities for another purpose, which a political organization can serve in a democratic community, i. e., the pursuit of offices. The defeated organization from henceforth recognized as its only purpose the regaining of power in order to divide the "spoils" among its members. Since in the beginning the population were actually divided into two camps which really rested upon principles, so for the future, a bi-party division of the political population was necessary.

* * *

At the time of the Civil war, the slave question once more introduced a principle over which to struggle. The Republican party appeared with a sharply distinguished programme, whose central point was the relentless fighting of slavery (1). But this ground of party antagonism disappeared even quicker than those which arose during the first decade of the Republic. With the abolition of slavery the Republican party lost its reason for existence, nevertheless it did not disappear. But now for the first time the absolutely non-principled character of the two great parties appeared in all its boldness. Today they are indeed only organizations for the purpose of hunting offices, "All has been lost except office, or the hope of it" (*Bryce*) and "Politics is merely a means for getting and distributing places" (*Ostrogorski*.) This shows itself especially clear in the fact that in the United States, the country of democracy, par excellence, there is no such thing as "party government." There are really no longer any parties in Congress. The strong discipline which rules during elections ends on the threshold of Congress. Here each individual representative acts on his own judgment. Politics resolves itself into a mass of private businesses in which the individual representatives are united, whether these belong to the government itself or to the various groups of interest in the population who have their representatives in Congress. Accordingly the decisive actions are taken in the half secrecy of the committee rooms, while the open proceedings have sunk into almost complete insignificance.

* * *

There is another peculiarity of the great parties which is noteworthy for the question which we are discussing, because of its effect upon the internal relations between the old parties and

(1) This statement contains a historical inaccuracy, which is the sooner pardoned, since it is universally accepted by American historians. The Republican party did not by any means enter upon the field as the antagonist of slavery, but simply as a representative of small capitalist interests, in antagonism to those of the chattel slave owners. This, however, does not effect the conclusions which are drawn in the text. *Trans.*

the proletariat. It is just these features which make it extremely easy for the worker to owe allegiance to the traditional parties; because they do not clearly represent any specific class interest, but are essentially only indefinite unions for purposes, to which as we have seen even the representatives of the proletariat, are in no way indifferent (the hunt for offices); so it is easy for even the "class conscious" laborer to unite with one of the two parties. I say one of the two, since the allegiance of the laborers to either of the parties is determined almost wholly by local accidents.

* * *

Undoubtedly both of the great parties have a strong popular side to their make-up. This is not simply because both of them have during their history had epochs in which they were the spokesman for some sort of "oppressed" class. The Republican party boasts of its defence of the slaves, while the Democrats tell of how they stood for the exploited farmer.

Still more important is the fact that even at present all their organizations have their roots in the mass of the people. Their bosses and the great majority of the workers have risen from the lower classes and often reach even the most leading party positions. We see the system of the Catholic church in operation here, which resting upon the purely democratic basis erects its hierarchy of party organization upon the faith of the people. The humblest worker in the saloon knows that the party boss has come from the ranks. This faith appears to me the most essential factor in all party organizations. It is in the end much more important than the most skillfully worked out programme. One of the great powers of attraction of the Social Democracy in Germany arises out of the faith that the masses have in their leaders, whom they have seen suffer for them. This is one of the great effects which still remains of the anti-socialist laws in building up a party.

This close sympathetic feeling between the people and the political leaders requires constant attention. The leaders must constantly use clever systematic methods in order to retain the good favor of the masses. Success in elections depends primarily upon the votes of the great masses. As a result the proletariat with all the lower classes of the people is in the fortunate situation that two great parties are in competition for its favor. These facts have had as a result that both parties seek to gain the favor of this electoral class, even by slight concessions (at least in some districts) to the predominant wage working class.

In order to utilize still further this condition in which the ruling parties find themselves, a very peculiar system has lately been developed by the representatives of labor interest "the system of questioning candidates," which its opponents (the members

of the Socialist party) have characterized with the somewhat contemptuous designation of the "begging policy" but which seems, however, to have obtained great favor in the great mass of the organized workers of America. It consists in the presentation, by the representative of labor interests, especially the leaders of the trades unions or of the great associations of trades unions, of a carefully worked out list of questions to the candidates who are about to appeal to the votes of the laborers, and then to cast their votes according to the answers to the questions. [Here follows a rather full explanation of the system of questioning candidates as explained in the extra number of the *American Federationist* for July 15, 1901, and with which most of our readers are familiar.]

The anti-socialist trades union leaders have great hopes of this system. They feel quite sure that by means of it they are going to be able to definitely avoid the threatening danger of an independent socialist working class party. There are others who see in the introduction of this system of questioning the beginning of the end of the old conditions, because they think that the lack of success which the working class, in their opinion, are experiencing, will necessarily lead those who have thus begun to participate in politics to a renunciation of the old parties. I shall not introduce this question here, since I am not here concerned with the probable future developments, but only with the reasons which have hitherto prevented the rise of a powerful socialist party in the U. S. Among these reasons one of the most important is undoubtedly the fact that the working class, even after they have begun to follow "independent politics," still live in the belief that they can secure what they desire by skillful utilization of the old two party system.

VI

All that I have so far said concerning the peculiar attitude of the American workingman to politics seems to be plausibly explained by the statement that the proletariat of the U. S., up to the present time, has not formed its own party, because of the lack of any official political representative of socialist views. This does not, however, completely explain it, because this in turn is so largely due to the attitude of unquestioned admiration for the state and society which rules in wide circles of the American working class. Nor is the working class so low that we can account for its joyful optimism regarding the state simply to the expectation of obtaining office. Here also we must seek for deeper reasons, and we shall find that the fundamental disinclination of the American worker to socialist tendencies, in the developed European sense, is in large part due to the peculiarity of the political conditions; his love for the existing state espe-

cially can certainly be explained from the political position which he occupies in this state.

Many observers have remarked the peculiarity of the American citizen that he looks upon the government of his country as a sort of divine institution, and which he honors with faithful respect. His attitude towards the constitution is as towards something holy that is removed from human criticism. This has been rightly designated as a "constitutional fetich worship." This position is drilled into the American worker from childhood in school and in public life. Indeed he has no reason to change the opinion which has been thus inoculated into him, when he comes to his own convictions. It is true that for him, as the representative of the great mass,—the people—there are rights granted in the government that are of great significance.

We have already discussed the radically democratic character of the government when we considered the extent of the suffrage. But all these individual rights are of much less significance than the declaration of the government that it can itself be changed by the people in direct balloting. Thereby the whole government is placed upon a basis of popular sovereignty. The sovereign people alone decide what shall be legal in the realm of the American union. This legal situation has a number of far reaching consequences in determining the mental attitude of public life. It has nourished what may be called the democratic *phrase* and brought it to an exaggerated development.

The many calls upon the citizens at election has assisted in forcing this development further. Over and over again sounds the appeal to the "holy rights of the people," again and again the individual man feels himself surrounded with the halo of "sovereignty." "We the free people of America"..... "we the people of the state of.....grateful to Almighty God for our freedom".....is drilled into the ears of the American from childhood. The least and most insignificant proletarian shares in this divine sovereignty, he is the people and the people is the state. (Nominally!)

From this there arise in each individual a boundless feeling of power, which, however, imaginary it may really be, is undoubtedly a reality in his consciousness. "The citizens believe that he is king in the state and that he can set things in order if he only wishes." The words of the popular speaker, "When the American people arise in their power and majesty" are by no means empty phrases to his hearers. Each individual among them believes in this mysterious power which he calls the "American people" and which nothing can withstand. He has a mystical faith in the effectiveness of the popular will and

speaks of it in a sort of religious ecstasy. This faith often stands in striking contrast with the actual results or even efforts. The citizen seldom moves a finger in order to abolish evils in the public life, but believes in the firm conviction that he has only to will it in order to bring about a desired end. And this conviction maintains in him a love of the legal and a hatred of the illegal which burns in him like a fire, of which, to be sure, a spark seldom shows itself, but it never goes out and may break out at any moment in a flame of enthusiasm which will spread light and warmth abroad.

In close connection with this there is another essential peculiarity of political life in the U. S., and that is the overpowering significance of "public opinion." This is fundamentally the actual ruling power which supports the departments of justice as well as the executive and legislative bodies. We saw that there was no "party government" in the sense that it exists in England, France or Italy. This depends upon the one side upon the peculiarities of the existing party relations, on the other hand it depends upon the conditions here set forth, that legally the sovereign people stands above all public powers and that they can send these whither they will at any moment. As a result of this the chosen representatives of the people whether they belong to the judicial, executive, legislative branches of government, depend for their existence upon continuous control of the masses, whose will, so far as it is not expressed in voting, finds expression in the mysterious "public opinion." The president and most of the governors have the right to veto acts of congress and the legislatures. They will use this, however, only when they are sure they have public opinion behind them. On the other hand the legislative body has the right to overthrow the veto by a two-third majority. The effectiveness of public opinion is naturally strengthened by the short electoral periods. This rulership of public opinion must once more contribute to immeasurably increase the consciousness of power in every ordinary citizen. If it is actually true that the general public opinion decides the course of politics, then naturally every citizen, including the laborer, feels himself a part, and an equal part with any trust magnate, of the great mass, which decides elections and determines "public opinion."

* * *

So it comes about that "public opinion" in America, at least until within very recent times, has been very sympathetic towards labor interests as such. In a twofold way this gave the laborer the consciousness that he amounted to something in the existence of the state. Shall he not then rejoice in the existence of this state? In a state that not only granted him a full share

in the public life, but in whom he was fully valued as a citizen politically and socially? He, in order to secure whose favor, everything must bend! The laborer certainly had subjectively, the full right to strike himself proudly on the breast and to raise his head and speak of himself as *civis Americanus sum*.

But certainly this formal equality in the state alone is not sufficient. As was said in the "*Doleances*" during the French Revolution, "The voice of freedom does not kindle the heart of a miserable one who is dying of hunger." A radical democratic constitution can attach the masses to the form of the state but it can not prevent his criticism of the ruling society and especially of the existing economic order, if this does not also grant to the people an endurable material existence. We should never seek to find the reasons for the lack of hostility to state and society exclusively in the peculiarities of the political position of the masses. This arises much more from what is comprehended in the phrase "economic condition." The task of the following studies shall be to bring forward the proof that the economic conditions also of the North American proletariat are suited, or more correctly, *were* suited to guard them from the entanglements of socialism.

WERNER SOMBART.

Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft.

Translated by A. M. Simons.

EDITORIAL

The Pittsburg Convention of the A. F. of L.

Comrade Hayes has described elsewhere the principal events of this convention, but there are a few things about it which "move us to remark." The financial report shows a steady falling off in receipts for the last two years. The history of trades unionism has never in any place offered a parallel to such a decline during a time of such rapidly advancing prices and increasing demand for laborers. Trades unions often decline during periods of industrial depression, and such a decline is no sign of weakness but a decline on the upward sweep of the industrial pendulum is a sign of approaching death.

Never before has the A. F. of L. shown itself so bound, body and soul, to plutocracy as at this convention. The Civic Federation, through its puppets, Gompers & Co., sought to impress upon that portion of the labor movement enrolled beneath the A. F. of L. the stamp of plutocracy and they succeeded. The few socialists in attendance presented almost a pitiable if not a ludicrous spectacle. If anything were wanted to justify the establishment of the I. W. W. it was furnished by the last convention of the A. F. of L.

While noticing this convention we cannot pass over the fact that in his eagerness to do the bidding of his masters Gompers overstepped his usual caution and placed in his opening address a falsehood so evident and a slander so vile as to be evident to all save those who have forgotten how to think. We refer to the words contained in his attack upon the Western Federation of Miners, where he stated that the money given by the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor (which by the way is something wholly different from Gompers' clique) was only for the purpose of appealing the Colorado cases to higher court and "that up to this moment there it not a scintilla of evidence indicating the fulfilment of the expressed intention to carry any of the cases involved to the higher tribunal" and "that these funds have been prevented from their proper source and diverted to financing a hostile movement, a movement having for its avowed purpose of destruction of the trades unions."

Our space prevents any full and complete exposure of how particularly despicable this lying is, but those who wish to know the truth can well afford to send to the Miners' Magazine, Denver, Colo., and ask for their issue of November 23, in which the whole truth of the matter is set forth backed up by a mass of documentary proofs which admit of no denial. Suffice it to say here that not only are the cases being carried up and that they have been fought at every inch of the way, but that the Western Federation of Miners is practically the only union publishing a complete list of all its expenditures, whose accuracy is vouched for by a bonded firm of accountants.

We publish in this issue an article by Prof. Frederick J. Turner, of the University of Wisconsin, on "The Frontier in American History." Although this article has appeared before, it was in technical publications, having a circulation within an extremely limited circle, so that it is safe to say that not 10 per cent of our readers ever heard of it. This article is without a doubt the greatest contribution yet made in the application of the materialistic interpretation of history to American conditions. The positions here set forth for the first time have been adopted by many other writers and so have in a way become familiar, but the article itself still constitutes an indispensable preliminary study to the understanding of the development of American society.

Comrade Upton Sinclair is arranging a co-operative plan of publication for his new book "The Jungle". This book is without doubt the greatest socialist novel yet published. Those of our readers who wish to know more of the plan can address Comrade Sinclair, at Princeton, N. J.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

AUSTRIA.

The national convention of the Austrian Social Democracy met at Vienna the first of November. Its entire proceedings were dominated by the spirit of revolt inspired by the events taking place just over the border in Russia. It was determined to at once begin a revolutionary movement for the attainment of universal suffrage. Comrade Ellenbogen introduced a resolution on universal suffrage from which the following are extracts: "The decisive moment has arrived. The present parliament will shortly end its infamous existence. . . . In this crisis the convention of the Austrian Social Democracy must recognize as its highest and holiest duty to make every effort, to draw back before no sacrifice in order to prevent the people of Austria from enduring again at a new election the horrors that have existed at previous ones and that the people have endured during the six terrible years of the just disappearing parliament of privilege. The convention demands that the comrades enter upon a campaign of popular agitation for this right of equality and to draw back before no means that may be clearly seen to be necessary in carrying on this decisive battle among the masses. . . . Finally to be prepared in spite of the rulers' short-sightedness and cowardly inactivity to enter if necessary upon a *Massenstreik*."

Comrade Schuhmeier, representative in parliament from Vienna, in speaking of this resolution, declared: "We have had discussions enough, let us now proceeds to deeds. When the news from Russia lies before us, our place is no longer here, but out on the streets of Vienna. We cannot wait until the meeting of parliament on the 21st of November, events call us to earlier action. It is not our position to stand here and speak, but to go out there where we belong among the people to arouse them to liberating inactivity."

Representative Daszynski spoke as follows: "It is our privilege to have lived in the moment for which so many races and so many millions of fighters have so long waited—the moment when the violent rulership of the Czar of all the Russias is sinking into its grave. A measureless feeling of liberation overcomes us and we shed tears of joy around this grave, for we know these tears are mixed with the fresh-flowed blood of our best and noblest; the best among us who have been conquered by the belief in justice and who have made the feeling of humanity something real among us, will make the very gallows upon which they die, change from dry wood into the holy tree of freedom and transform the prisons into the Meccas of the pilgrims of the free humanity of the future. The hot wind that blows from the east will dry up the tears of the working class and arouse many to a recognition of our slavery and

our shame. In this powerful stream of time in which we are fortunate to live, this miserable state of Austria will also play a part, whether with or against its will, will be driven forward. This Austria cannot stand still, this Austria of slavery, this Austria of injustice, this Austria of the savage outbreak of suicidal chauvinism, this Austria must also go down to its grave. (Thunderous applause.)"

On the last day of the meeting Victor Adler introduced the following resolution on the *Massenstreik*, which was unanimously adopted: "The convention stands upon the foundation of the resolutions of the Amsterdam congress. It accordingly rejects all fantastic projects of a national or international general strike for the purpose of overthrowing the social order, whether these projects come from anarchistic, 'anarcho socialist' or unionist side.

"Accordingly the congress recognizes in the *Massenstreik* a single great branch of an extreme but effective political means of fighting, that in certain decisive moments brings into effect, for clearly defined and limited purposes, the whole power of the politically and economically organized working class, in order either to prevent a reactionary attack of tyrants upon the political and economic rights of the proletariat or in order to conquer against a final resistance the granting of a long due right of the proletariat.

"In this sense the preparation of the *Massenstreik* does not endanger the political and economical organization of the workers, but is one of the most effective means with which to protect and maintain the possibility and security of every form of proletarian organization.

"The success of this method of fighting depends upon the same conditions as that of every proletarian battle: upon the degree of extension of class consciousness, upon the strength, firmness and unity in every form, and especially upon the economic form, of the organization of the working class, and finally from the clear, energetic and sacrificing manner in which it is carried out. The congress therefore demands of the workers of Austria that in these days of political crisis, which may at any hour require decisive action, to work with doubled energy for the building up of their political and economic organizations, which in the time of battle will be so much more effective and dangerous to their enemies, the firmer and the stronger they are.

"The congress leaves it in the hands of the trusted officials of the proletarian organization to decide at what moment in the battle for suffrage, whose attainment is a necessity of life to the proletariat, it is best to apply the political *Massenstreik*, and knows that in so doing the full weight of responsibility will be recognized, for an action which will lay heavy sacrifices upon the proletariat, and hold them responsible that nothing essential will be left undone to prepare the way for victory for the working class."

AUSTRALIA.

From the *Worker*, of Brisbane, we learn that the wave of reaction which the socialists have long predicted is now striking New Zealand. The government now proposes to practically abolish the famous Arbitration Act. It has introduced a bill which, according to the above authority, "openly aims at three things: the destruction of trades unionism; the destruction of the principle of industrial arbitration; the return to the old system under which wages were regulated solely by the necessity of the individual workman." In other words, the class struggle has now struck Australia good and hard, and the old reform movement has been driven aside as the field is being cleared for a straight fight. At the same time throughout Australia socialism is growing as never before.

This was shown in a recent communication to the New York *Nation*, which certainly will not be accused of having the slightest sympathy with the Socialist Party. According to the correspondent of this publication, the fight throughout Australia has now become clearly one between socialism and capitalism, and while the writer is most bitterly opposed to socialism he can not admit that as a result of the campaign "politics were lifted to a higher level. Men who in England had lived through the great days of Gladstone and Disraeli, Bright and Lowe, and who deplored the pettiness of Australian public life, were gratified to find the greatest questions brought within the field of discussion and to the verge of action. The mediocre personalities of political leaders were aggrandized by the cause they advocated." This writer also admits the socialist contention that when the competitive era begins to disappear into that of monopoly the reform legislation for which Australia has been so famous would be swept aside and he states that Mr. Seddon, the famous New Zealand socialistic minister, recently introduced a new bill providing for the building of cottages for the houseless "with the melancholy confession that in spite of all the beneficent industrial legislation of the past ten or twelve years, projected mainly in the interest of the laboring class, the condition of the worker had not been ameliorated. . . . The very prosperity of the country had penalized the worker and the entire mass of those who lived in other peoples' houses. The cost of living had risen fully as much as the wages of the workers had been raised."

Here is a lesson for those who are inclined to go off after the strange gods of Hearstism, and opportunism in general.

RUSSIA.

Russia has now entered upon a "permanent revolution," which was foretold in this department last month, and which may easily continue for one or two years yet. The capitalist press is now engaged in a frantic effort to show that the socialists are losing their grip on the revolutionary movement. The European papers, however, do not dare to serve out this sort of stuff, because they know that there are too many channels through which the truth can reach their readers. It is universally admitted that the one consistent coherent force in the midst of the chaos which now prevails throughout, what was once the kingdom of the Czar is furnished by the socialists. Every day sees new centers of revolt, new strikes, new defections from the army and navy, new uprisings among the peasantry, and these are all slowly but surely being formulated into a solidified class-conscious mass demanding universal suffrage without regard to sex, and the establishment of a government which in all respects shall be far more democratic than any that has hitherto existed.

In the meantime money is urgently needed with which to buy guns and ammunition to carry on the war for freedom. The cry is no longer for propaganda leaflets, but for powder and bullets and rifles. If the Russian workers will shed their blood in our fight, for it is our fight as much as theirs, we should not begrudge the dollars.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The silver jubilee convention of the American Federation of Labor was held in Pittsburgh during the past month, and, while from the standpoint of attendance of delegates and visitors it was a success, still when a retrospective view is taken of the affair it is difficult to mention a single act of the session that stands out above the mediocre routine of former gatherings. The officers' reports were fairly satisfactory—that is, if we can be satisfied when the federation holds its own and is practically at a standstill just at a period when it has been subjected to considerable attack from the employers' associations and so-called citizens' alliances.

There were upward of 350 delegates present representing 85 of the 116 affiliated international unions, as well as 23 state and 73 city central organizations. Some of the information contained in the exhaustive reports submitted is quite interesting, not only to union men and women directly, but also to people generally who are not connected with organized labor, and who have no time or opportunity to wade through the long columns of figures and words that are produced by the officials, or who only obtain a one-sided view of trade unions, as, for example, during periods of strikes.

Stripped of superfluous verbiage, 60 national unions—a few more than one-half of the total number—paid out in sick and death, traveling, tool insurance and out-of-work benefits over \$1,500,000 during the past year. For instance, the carpenters expended \$191,000 in death benefits, the cigarmakers \$151,752, molders \$58,000, and printers \$39,000. The disease that swelled the mortality list most was tuberculosis—the great white plague for which modern capitalism is largely responsible.

The cigarmakers paid their traveling members \$58,000, considerably more than an average of one dollar per capita, while the sum of \$30,000 was expended as unemployed benefits. The amalgamated carpenters, with a trifle less than 5,000 members (distinguished from the brotherhood carpenters, who have 144,000 members), expended \$18,500 in unemployed benefits, \$3,500 for lost tools, and \$8,250 sick benefits. The haters paid \$10,000 to members out of work, the machinists paid \$50,000 to their sick, and the boot and shoe workers a fraction less than \$80,000 for the same purpose. Those among the molders who were ill received a total of \$176,000 in round numbers, while the barbers drew \$37,000 from a similar fund.

The tendency toward centralization in this industrial movement is as clearly reflected as in the world of capital. Of the unions reporting it is noteworthy that 2,359 charters were surrendered, while only 2,106 charters were issued, a net loss of 253. Yet the net gain in membership exceeded 38,000. Many of the charters that were surrendered were given up because local unions were merged.

Coming down to strike statistics, it is interesting to note that over \$2,500,000 was expended in waging contests upon the industrial field, in a total of 1,157 strikes. The number of persons involved is given as 107,268, the number of benefited 63,350, and 53,028 were worsted. Thirty-two national organizations reported gaining higher wages, with or without strikes, and thirteen secured reductions in hours of labor.

The unions that increased wages were: Asbestos workers, blacksmiths, blast furnace workers, broom makers, carpenters, carriage and wagon workers, commercial telegraphers, coopers, electrical workers, elevator constructors, stationary firemen, foundry employes, glass bottle blowers, glass workers, granite cutters, hatters, hod carriers, hotel and restaurant employes, lathers, leather workers (both national unions), paper box workers, printing pressmen, quarrymen, street railway employes, theatrical stage employes, tailors, tip printers, tobacco workers and wire weavers. The unions that reduced hours of labor were: Blacksmiths, boilermakers, carriage workers, cement workers, clerks, electrical workers, stationary firemen, leather workers, metal polishers and brass workers, paper makers, quarrymen, cotton mule spinners and tobacco workers.

Beyond these reports showing the activity of some of the affiliated international unions there is little if anything to record that will make the Pittsburg convention live in history, or that tended in even the most remote degree to lend encouragement to the progressive element in the labor world. It is noticeable that President Gompers' reports become longer each year in proportion as they contain less of real merit. He consumed practically all of the time during the afternoon of the first day in inflicting his ponderous platitudes and generalizations upon the delegates who would listen, sandwiched in with the usual regrets, apologies, attacks, etc. In fact, Gompers persists in always monopolizing a greater part of the time the first three days, and thereafter insists on taking the center of the stage at the slightest provocation. There is nothing in the world that pleases President Gompers more than to be ceremonious to the limit and to pose before a gaping and admiring audience; he would have made quite a success as an actor if he were not so short and as slow as a seven-years' itch. During the first five days of the convention, when Gompers wasn't talking, adjournments were taken. The sessions became farcical; everybody complained of the tameness of the convention. "Start something! Why don't you Socialists start something?" was the cry of the delegates on every hand. "Start something yourselves," the Socialists replied.

Finally, along about Monday of the second week the good, old jurisdiction wrangle began; the painters succeeded in tearing loose a portion of the car workers; then came the struggle of the steamfitters for a charter, although for several years they had been told to get into the plumbers' union, and they were tentatively successful. But when it came to granting the stogiemakers a charter, the consistency of the brethren was rudely fractured, for they turned down the request and told the stogiemakers to hike into the cigarmakers' organization. The bitterest fights took place between the longshoremen and seamen, followed by the usual attack of the engineers, firemen, teamsters and coopers upon the brewery workers. It is becoming quite clear that the latter are singled out for dismemberment, and it was disgusting to observe the manner in which the craft unions, the so-called autonomists, combined against the brewers and crammed a compulsory arbitration scheme down their throats (although they professed to be opposed to compulsory arbitration themselves), and then forced the whole jurisdiction squabble into city central bodies, where some lovely family quarrels will doubtless be had during the coming year. It looks as though the longshoremen

will be up against the same fight in the near future that the brewers are, and then perhaps the reactionists, led by Gompers, will camp on the trail of the miners. If the autonomists are consistent, which, however, is not always the case, that will be the logical outcome. The discouraging feature about it is that the industrialists could control the conventions and the federation if they pulled together, but up to the present the big organizations have been unable to work in harmony. Some of them reach out and attempt to absorb those whom they consider rivals, and then prate beautifully about a "craft autonomy." For example, the carpenters swear they will swallow the amalgamated woodworkers, and yet oppose the industrialism of the brewers. Practically the only thing that was gained as the result of four days' jurisdiction fights was the adoption of a resolution to bring about a conference between the carpenters and woodworkers' representatives—no more and no less than what was accomplished at the New Orleans convention, three years ago. The chances are that nothing will come of any of the propositions adopted. All the unions involved in factional disputes will continue to waste a barrel of money and much time to show concentrated capitalism how not to unite in a compact, militant force that recognizes that an injury to one is the concern of all.

But perhaps the most reactionary move made in this farcical convention was Gompers' high-handed ruling that two resolutions—one introduced by the hat and cap workers' national organization and the other by the Wilkesbarre (Pa.) central body—which were couched in socialistic terms and suggested independent political action, WERE OUT OF ORDER in A. F. of L. conventions. The resolutions were not of a partisan nature—in fact, the hat and cap workers proposed that a commission be appointed to investigate and report at the next convention plans to organize the workers to make a combined attack upon capitalism along practical lines. Yet Wm. Mahon, president of the street railway employees, whether in jest or in earnest, made the point that the resolutions were in conflict with a provision of the constitution, which prohibited the convention from taking partisan political action, and which section has really been obsolete for years, and Gompers promptly ruled in his favor and choked off further debate. More than that, while Delegate Lavin, of the Wilkesbarre central body, was discussing his resolution his time expired. A motion was made that Lavin's time be extended, a courtesy that is shown scores of times in every convention. Because there was an objection Gompers refused to put the motion and Lavin was ruled off the floor. That is how the immaculate, fair-minded (?) Gompers performs. He has become completely intoxicated with his power, and unless one talks and writes as he dictates one receives little consideration. It has been remarked by some of his friends that Gompers is becoming very peevish and irritable; he is likely to lose his temper at the slightest provocation, and never misses an opportunity to display his annoyance if a Socialist or any other delegate who honestly differs from him criticizes his views or acts.

It was the belief of many delegates that the Pittsburg convention marked the turning point in A. F. of L. history. Events during the coming year will demonstrate whether or not their predictions are correct.

BOOK REVIEWS

GERMS OF MIND IN PLANTS, by R. H. Francé. Translated by A. M. Simons. Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1905, Cloth, 147 pp., 50c.

The history of modern scientific knowledge is the history of our advance toward a monistic conception of the universe. In the Cartesian philosophy a sharp division was conceived between man and the lower animals, the latter figuring as mere automata devoid of sensation. Though the progress of science quickly dispelled that illusion, still more than two centuries had to pass before men could discern all the links which make the unbroken chain of organic life. During that period no serious investigator dreamed of ascribing to the vegetable kingdom any power of feeling or of initiative. With the advent of the new botany all this was changed. Plants were seen to be endowed with sensation which differs only in degree from that possessed by their superiors in the scale of development, even by man himself. In the suggestive and poetic nature study now before us we see a picture of mind stuff in the making. We see trees and flowers taking rest and nourishment, defending themselves against injury and seeking spontaneously those conditions most favorable to their growth. We see indications of the actual presence of the senses of smell and taste among them. We observe their sensitiveness to temperature, to the force of gravity, to a multitude of stimuli, many of which are far too delicate for human perception. What then do we learn from revelations like this? Simply the underlying *oneness* of all life. What do we infer? Simply the unity of the universe. The author does not attempt more than an introduction to this subject, neither does he claim for himself any special originality, but he views nature with the eyes of a man of science and tells us of his visions in the language of a poet. A philosopher he is not, and perhaps it is just the poetic quality of his mind which colors and confuses his philosophical conceptions. For instance, this little treatise is beyond question a document in support of monism and the author recognizes the tendency of his own teaching. Nevertheless on more than one occasion we find him losing sight of his central truth as in the following passage:

"I have often thought that the peculiar riddle of life consisted in just this—how an apparently all powerful creativeness can be united to a scheme of physical forces. Perhaps the wisdom of Empedocles offers the true solution, and there is an unconfined spirit in everything, which can only gradually free itself from the bonds of matter—most of all in us, less in the animals, and still less in the plants, and becoming in its lowest manifestation only perceptible, as an eternal causal relation, in dead matter itself. This poetical figure is perhaps the best description of the reality."

We agree with Francé that this is a poetic figure, but we cannot

agree with him that it stands for reality. "Unconfined spirit" is unconceivable since we only know spirit as it exists within the *confines* of material substance, and as for the phrase "dead matter" it means nothing since not a particle of matter exists destitute of the power of initiative, destitute of the potentiality of life. Evidently, too, Francé still cherishes a belief in Kant's "thing in itself." On this point, however, the translator's note is a sufficient reply.

LILIAN HILLER UDELL.

MAX SCHIPPEL. AMERIKA UND DIE HANDELSVERTRAGSPOLITIK. *Sozialistischen Monatsheften*. Paper, 133 pages, 2.30 Marks.

We have here a careful statistical study of the commercial policy of the United States, such as no native writer has furnished us. The main portion of the work is taken up with a discussion of the probable outcome of the international tariff war which must arise as a result of the protective measures being taken by European nations against the United high tariff policy. The United States depends upon Europe as the foreign market for its agriculture produce but refuses to permit the introduction of European manufactured produce. As a result European manufacturers are shutting out American cereals and meats and the brunt of the fight, as always falls upon the producing classes of the two countries.

THOUGHTS OF A FOOL, EVELYN GLADYS. *Charles H. Kerr & Co., Cloth, 258 pages. Price \$1.00.*

This is a book that can best be described by the word clever. The author after having first assured us by her title that she lives in the thinnest kind of a glass house herself, proceeds to throw bricks at everything within her reach without any particular discrimination. In such a wholesale iconoclastic raid some idols are sure to be shattered that deserve it, and the book is full of bright, sharp things that can be quoted against different institutions. However, the author is utterly lacking in two fundamental essentials to any really intelligent instructive social criticism. She in no way recognizes the historical function of institutions, and never stops to consider whether they really might have played a part, or indeed as to whether they are playing an essential part to-day in social evolution. In the second place there is no recognition of the fact that the individual generally succeeds in the widest expression of his own personality through some social institution of which he is a part. Robinson Crusoe's individuality had very slight room for expression compared with that of even the most conventional members of modern society. Incidentally the author is guilty of a sin which is very common among such writers, of unconsciously bowing down before conventionality and accepting it as the standard from which all things are to be judged. Extremes have met once more, and the author and Mrs. Grundy accept the same standard and starting point, only measuring in opposite directions. One prays to good God, the other to good Devil, but neither makes great use of her reason.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

BOOKS FOR THE HOLIDAYS.

The buying of books for Christmas gifts is a custom that is on the increase. For socialists this gives a chance for education and propaganda that should not be passed by. Only it is necessary to use judgment. It is not advisable to give Marx's *Capital* to a sixteen-year-old nor Evelyn Gladys' *"Thoughts of a Fool"* to a preacher. In selecting a book for a non-socialist it is sometimes better to take a work of science or fiction that will subtly destroy some of his prejudice, rather than come at him with a book that obtrudes its socialism on the title page.

We shall try here to give clear enough descriptions of a few of our books to enable our readers to select the right presents for the right people.

LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS. Four volumes in this library are now ready—"The Evolution of Man," by Wilhelm Boelsche; "*Germes of Mind in Plants*," by R. H. Francé; "*The End of the World*," by Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer; and "*Science and Revolution*," by Ernest Untermann. All but the last are easy reading for young people, while all without exception contain much that is new even to university graduates. Comrade Untermann's work is especially of interest to socialists who wish to arrive at a clear understanding of the relation of the socialist philosophy to modern science. These four books are daintily bound in light blue silk, stamped with an attractive design, and are uniform in size and style. Price, 50 cents a volume.

STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES. These books are uniform in size with the Library of Science for the Workers, but the binding is red instead of blue. The price is 50 cents a volume. The eleven volumes now ready, together with the four volumes of our Library of Science, make the best possible nucleus for a socialist library. New volumes in both series will be published during 1906 at the rate of at least one volume a month and probably more rapidly than this.

1. Liebknecht's *Memoirs of Marx* are full of human interest, humor and pathos—a thoroughly delightful book—and at the same time they are an important help to an understanding of the socialist movement.

2. Vandervelde's *Collectivism* is on the whole the most satisfactory single volume to consult for a clear statement of the whole socialist position.
3. Simons' *The American Farmer* is a history of agriculture in the United States, showing how the farmer has been affected by the growth of concentration, and that his material interests are now bound up with those of the wage-worker.
4. *The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association*, by Isaac Broome, is a graphic recital of facts that should be enough to convince any rational reader that the way to establish socialism is *not* to go into the wilderness and start a colony.
5. Engels' *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* is a clear, concise history of facts generally unknown, showing that wealth and poverty instead of being eternal are a transient phase of man's development.
6. Kautsky's *The Social Revolution* explains the real difference between reform and revolution, and answers the frequent question as to what socialists would do on the day after the revolution.
7. Engels' *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific* is one of the few absolutely indispensable books for the socialist student, giving as it does a clear idea of the difference between International Socialism and the various reform movements.
8. Engels' *Feuerbach* is a conclusive argument for the clear-cut, materialist philosophy of socialism, as opposed to the muddled systems which retain ideas belonging to traditional religion.
9. Ladoff's *American Pauperism* is a study of the last census, bringing out in clear relief the increasing exploitation of labor, which is intentionally obscured in the government reports.
10. Blatchford's *Britain for the British (America for the Americans)* is one of the best and most forcible presentations of the elementary principles of socialism ever written: just the thing for beginners.
11. Volume Eleven consists of two socialist classics bound together: the *Communist Manifesto*, by Marx and Engels, and *No Compromise, No Political Trading*, by Wilhelm Liebknecht.

SOCIAL SCIENCE SERIES. These handsome volumes are the cream of a large library issued by Swan Sonnenschein & Co., a prominent London publishing house. Everything in this list is well worth reading and preserving.

Single Volumes, \$1.00 each.

The Student's Marx: an Introduction to Karl Marx's "Capital." By Edward Aveling, D. Sc.

The Origin and Growth of Village Communities in India. By B. H. Baden-Powell, M. A., C. E. I.

The Religion of Socialism: Being Essays in Modern Socialist Criticism. By Ernest Belfort Bax.

The Ethics of Socialism: Being Further Essays in Modern Socialist Criticism. By Ernest Belfort Bax.

Outlooks from the New Standpoint! By Ernest Belfort Bax.

The New Reformation, and Its Relation to Moral and Social Problems. By Ramsden Balmforth.

Ferdinand Lassalle as a Social Reformer. By Edward Bernstein.

Civilization, Its Cause and Cure, and Other Essays. By Edward Carpenter.

England's Ideal, and Other Papers on Social Subjects. By Edward Carpenter.

Bismarck and State Socialism. By William Harbutt Dawson.

German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle. By William Harbutt Dawson.

The Evolution of Property from Savagery to Civilization. By Paul Lafargue.

Revolution and Counter-Revolution, or Germany in 1848. By Karl Marx.

Parasitism, Organic and Social. By Jean Massart and Emile Vandervelde.

Overproduction and Crises. By Karl Rodbertus.

Work and Wages. By James E. Thorold Rogers, M. P.

The Quintessence of Socialism. By Dr. A. Schaeffle.

Double Volumes, \$1.25 each.

The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844. By Frederick Engels.

The Economic Foundations of Society. By Achille Loria.

Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome. By William Morris and Ernest Belfort Bax.

GOD AND MY NEIGHBOR. By Robert Blatchford. A book on religion from the viewpoint of International Socialism, artistically delightful in its literary style, sweet-tempered in its treatment of opponents, and logical in its conclusions. Cloth, \$1.00; paper, 50 cents.

THE RECORDING ANGEL. By Edwin Arnold Brenholtz. A novel of the class struggle, turning on a great strike by the laborers of the steel trust. A well-constructed plot holds the reader intently to the last chapter. The socialism in the story is not in the shape of large chunks of arguments, but is intimately woven into the plot, so that it cannot be skipped. Just the book to make new converts. Cloth, \$1.00.

THE VOICE OF EQUALITY. By Edwin Arnold Brenholtz. A series of connected poems in free rhythm, embodying a strong appeal from the emotional side in behalf of the revolutionary movement. Cloth, \$1.00.

TOWARDS DEMOCRACY. By Edward Carpenter. Carpenter is well known to our readers through his delightful volume of essays entitled

"Love's Coming-of Age" (Cloth, \$1.00). But his reputation as a writer rests mainly on his poem "Towards Democracy." This poem, written at different times and enlarged by recent additions to a volume of 517 pages, is on the whole the best poetic interpretation of the socialist view of life that has yet been produced. The meter is the free rhythm introduced by Whitman, but Carpenter is no mere imitator of Whitman, and the artistic beauty of the poetry will appeal to those still unfamiliar with socialism. Extra cloth, gilt top, \$2.50.

THE STORY OF A DREAM. By Ethel Maude Colson. This is not a socialist story, but of the "new thought" order. It is humanitarian rather than capitalistic in its tendency and is decidedly entertaining. It is a handsome cloth-bound volume of 304 pages. The original price was a dollar, and the book is mechanically equal to the books usually sold at that price, but to close out the copies on hand (in perfect condition) we offer them at 30 cents postpaid or 20 cents if sent at purchaser's expense.

ROBERTA. A novel of Chicago. By Blanche Fearing. A graphic picture of capitalistic conditions by a writer who felt the injustice without clearly understanding it. This is another dollar novel which we are closing out at the same rates as "The Story of a Dream."

ON THE ROAD TO THE LAKE. By Sam Flint. A free thought novel bitterly lampooning certain shining lights of orthodox theology. This is another of the books issued before this was a socialist publishing house, and is also being reduced from one dollar to 30 cents postpaid or 20 cents by express.

One more book at this reduced rate is THE LAST TENET IMPOSED UPON THE KHAN OF THOMATHOZ, by Hudor Genone. This is a remarkably clever and witty story, with pictures as funny as the text. It is a good-humored satire on the Calvinistic theory of election and predestination.

THOUGHTS OF A FOOL. By Evelyn Gladys. A book of revolutionary essays, one of which, "Shoes, Pigs and Problems," is also published in booklet form at two cents. The essays are delightfully clever and entertaining, and while they are not written with a complete understanding of socialism, they are well worth circulating for the emphasis they give to the important principle involved in the socialist position, that we believe in doing away with the authority of the state over the individual morals of its citizens, and confining our elected officials to the more useful function of seeing that people's material wants are supplied. The book is exquisitely printed and bound. We have reduced the retail price from \$1.50 to \$1.00.

MIND AND BODY: Suggestion and Hypnotism Applied in Medicine and Education. By A. C. Halphide, M. D. This is a distinctly rational and scientific book on a subject which has been too much associated with cheap mysticism and quackery. Dr. Halphide is a scientist and a ma-

terialist, and in this book he has given more actual information than was to be had in the correspondence courses advertised and sold at from \$5 to \$100. The book is handsomely and substantially bound, and contains a number of engravings from photographs.

THE SALE OF AN APPETITE. By Paul Lafargue. A wonderfully powerful story by one of the most prominent socialists of Europe. No one can read it without remembering it, and it carries its own moral. Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents.

WALT WHITMAN, THE POET OF THE WIDER SELFHOOD. By Mila Tupper Maynard. An introduction to the study of Whitman. Cloth, \$1.00.

WHITMAN'S POETICAL WORKS. With biographical introduction by John Burroughs. A book that should be in every socialist library, however small. Cloth, 75 cents.

GRACIA, A SOCIAL TRAGEDY. By Frank Everett Plummer. Fourth edition just ready. Illustrated with twelve engravings, mostly from art photographs posed expressly for this work. Cloth, gilt top, \$1.25. A booklet entitled "Was it Gracia's Fault," containing extracts from "Gracia" with discussions of the social and ethical questions involved, will be mailed to any address for a two-cent stamp.

REBELS OF THE NEW SOUTH. By Walter Marion Raymond. A socialist novel written in a thoroughly charming style, and bringing out in a striking manner the contrast between commercial and socialist ideals. Cloth, illustrated, \$1.00.

THE REPUBLIC OF PLATO. Translated by Alexander Kerr, Professor of Greek in the University of Wisconsin. This work is the original utopia from which all later utopian writers have borrowed, and it occupies an important position in the history of philosophic thought. The present translation is commended by the most competent critics for its exact presentation of the author's thought and its readable English style. Four books now ready, daintily printed and bound, each book sold separately at 15 cents.

BOOKS IN PRESS.

THE CHANGING ORDER: A Study of Democracy. By Oscar Lovell Triggs, Ph. D., the professor who could not stay in Rockefeller's university because he taught truths that were dangerous. This work of 300 pages shows the effect of the growing spirit of industrial democracy on art, literature, religion and education. This work by Professor Triggs is in many respects the most important contribution to the literature of socialism that has been made for years. Cloth, \$1.00.

BETTER-WORLD PHILOSOPHY: A Sociological Synthesis. By J. Howard Moore. The first edition of this work, published in 1899 by the Ward-Waugh Company, received enthusiastic endorsements from George D.

Herron, Lester F. Ward, John P. Altgeld, Henry D. Lloyd, John Fiske and other trustworthy critics. Our new edition, ready December 16, will be handsomely bound in cloth and will be mailed for \$1.00.

THE TRIUMPH OF LIFE. By Wilhelm Boelsche, translated by May Wood Simons. This book will be even more original and interesting than the author's earlier work, "The Evolution of Man." It will be published in cloth, illustrated, uniform in style with the other volumes of the Library of Science for the Workers, and will be ready about the last of January. Price, 50 cents.

THE POSITIVE SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY. By Enrico Ferri, translated by Ernest Untermann. This book contains three lectures summing up the latest conclusions of science on the question of criminology, and will be of interest not only to socialists but to all students of social problems. It will be ready in January and will be the twelfth volume of the Standard Socialist Series. Price, 50 cents.

MORE BOOKS TO COME.

A number of other important books will be announced in the January number of the REVIEW. Meanwhile we need to receive at least \$1,500 within the next thirty days to pay for the printing of these new books. We expect to get it partly in the shape of cash orders for books and partly as subscription for stock. There are probably a thousand readers of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW who are intending to subscribe for stock some time. Why not now?

THE COMPANY'S FINANCES.

We are no longer in distress for money to pay debts. The outside debts are paid, with the exception of bills for work done in November, and these will be paid as fast as they come due out of the ordinary daily receipts of the business. The contributions to the debt-paying fund have been as follows:

Contributed in 1904	\$3,221.52
Acknowledged in last month's Review.....	1,223.48
Mrs. S. M. J. Craven, California.....	3.75
A. F. Simmonds, New York.....	1.00
James Patton, California	1.50
Howard Keehn, Pennsylvania	1.00
M. L. Barney, Wisconsin	2.80
T. J. Maxwell, Kansas.....	5.00
L. M. Powers, Massachusetts	2.35
Arthur J. Bazeley, Ohio	12.74
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	30.14
Total.....	<u>\$4,505.28</u>

About the middle of November we addressed a circular letter to most of our stockholders explaining that the business was now on a self-supporting basis, and that we asked for no more contributions, but could

use loans to advantage and could give satisfactory security for any sums advanced. The next day we received a call from Comrade Jacob Bruning of this city, who deposited with the company without interest \$400, which enabled us to pay the last outside note. Any money received from the sale of stock will now be used to make the plates of new books.

The early stockholders put in their money on faith, and took the risk of losing it all without seeing anything accomplished. Those who subscribe for stock now get at once the privilege of buying at cost about all the socialist books that are worth buying, and the satisfaction of knowing that their money is being used to bring out more books of the kind that the Socialist Party needs to circulate. Full particulars with price list of books will be mailed on request.

The receipts of the International Socialist Review for November were \$252.63. Maintain this monthly average for a year and there will be no deficit. The subscription price is one dollar a year to all alike, but for two dollars we will send the Review one year and will mail any books published by us to the amount of \$2.00 at retail prices. The books may be sent to one address and the Review to another if preferred. Address all business communications to

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY,

56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

JANUARY, 1906

NO. 7

Revolutions, Past and Present.

WHILE many within our own ranks may well be in doubt concerning the events of the present year, one thing is plain to-day even to the most stupid: Russia is now in the midst of a revolution, that for violence and significance may well be compared with the two greatest revolutions that history has as yet known—the English Revolution of the 17th century and the French of the 18th.

It is easy to draw comparisons between them, and their superficial resemblances are striking. Each of these revolutions was directed at absolutism, against which the mass of the nation arose, because its yoke had become unbearable—because it had brought misery, outrages and despair upon the country.

The resemblance does not go much further. We are met with fundamental differences the moment we penetrate beneath the political surface and investigate the class antagonisms which furnish the effective motive force of the movement.

There we find, first of all, as the great difference between earlier revolutions and the present one, that in the latter, for the first time in the history of the world, the industrial proletariat rises triumphantly as the dominant independent directing force. The rising of the Paris Commune of 1870 was but the revolt of a single city, suppressed within a few weeks. Now we see a revolution extending from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea, and from the Baltic to the Pacific, which has already continued for a year, and in which the proletariat grows ever mightier in power and self-consciousness.

To be sure we do not yet have the complete domination, the dictatorship of the proletariat,—not yet the socialist revolution, but only its beginnings. The proletariat of Russia is breaking its chains, only in order to free its hands for the class struggle against capitalism; it does not yet feel itself strong enough to attempt the expropriation of capital. But that the watchword of a proletarian class-struggle has been raised is a tremendous advance from the socialist standpoint, as contrasted with the revolutions of 1648 and 1789.

In each of these revolutions only the capitalist class was a victorious class. But, politically as well as economically, this class lives from the exploitation of the strength of others. It has never *made* a revolution, but always *exploited* them. It has always left the making of revolution, the fighting and its perils to the mass of the people. The real active force in the masses during the 17th and 18th centuries was not the proletariat, but the class of small traders and manufacturers; the proletariat was but their unconscious followers. It was the bold and self-conscious small capitalists of the metropolitan cities of London and Paris who dared to take up the leadership in the battle against absolutism, and who were successful in overthrowing it.

In Russia this class has been neither bold nor self-conscious, at least not during the last century, since there has been a Russian Czarism. It has been largely recruited only from uprooted peasants, who but a few decades ago were still serfs. And there is no great city dominating the whole Russian kingdom. Moreover, to-day, even in France and England the capital cities have lost their absolute domination, but must now share their power with the industrial cities; even in western Europe the small capitalists have ceased to be revolutionary, but have become rather a pillar of reaction and governmental power.

It is no wonder, therefore, that the small capitalists of Russia, together with the slum proletariat, have from the beginning joined the elements of the counter-revolution, placing themselves at the disposal of the police for the suppression of the revolution. But since this class of small capitalists has no political program and no political goal, it can be driven into the battle against the revolution only by the promise of private gain or the goal of personal revenge. But there is no booty to be gained by fighting a propertyless proletariat, and if this be armed only wounds and death. Consequently the reactionary little capitalist, as soon as he no longer has any political ideal becomes as cowardly as he is brutal; he vents his rage only on the weakest members of society. As an exploiter, he prefers women and children; in the present battle against the revolution he attacks only Jews and isolated students and not the sturdy laborers. So

the Russian counter-revolution soon becomes a riot of plunder, murder and arson. The revolutionary proletariat, in its battle against the reaction, is therefore as much the indisputable element in social progress, as it has long been the most significant element economically. On the other hand, the small capitalist class, so far as it does not unite with the proletariat, shows itself as a political factor to be capable of producing only evil and social destruction, just as economically it has to-day become little more than a parasite on the social body, maintaining its existence only at the expense of society.

In previous revolutions the peasantry have ranked next to the small trading class as the most important fighting group. To be sure the Peasant Revolt showed that even in the period of the Reformation, the latter class was capable only of destroying the state, but was no longer able to found a new independent political rulership. The peasantry no longer forms its own party, a definite political army, but serves only as auxiliary troops of some other army or party. Nevertheless it is by no means insignificant, since according as it throws its strength to one side or the other, it may determine defeat or victory. It sealed the downfall of the revolution in France in 1848, as well as the triumph of 1789 and the years that followed.

The role played by the peasantry in the great French Revolution, however, was wholly different from its part in the English one. In France the landed possessions of the nobility and clergy had maintained the full feudal form; they lived from the exploitation of the feudal peasantry, whom they pressed down with an inconceivable mass of misery, and in return for which, since they had become attaches of the court, they rendered no reciprocal service. The destruction of these landed possessions was one of the imperative tasks of the Revolution, and was the bond that secured the firm allegiance of the peasants.

In England the old feudal nobility had been destroyed during the War of the Roses, and had been replaced by a new fresh-baked nobility, who were in close sympathy with capitalism. The Reformation had plundered the churches for the benefit of this nobility. The old feudal economy had completely disappeared by the 17th century. What peasants remained were free masters of their own ground. The great landed possessions were not operated by the compulsory service of feudal peasants, but through capitalist tenants with wage-workers. Very few of the landed nobility had become attached to the court. The majority remained throughout the year upon their property, where they served as justices or in the local governments.

As a consequence the English revolution showed no tendency toward a general overthrow of landed property. To be

sure there were plenty of instances of the confiscation of property, but always as *political* and not as *social* measures. However covetous the peasants and tenants might have been of the great estates, no necessity compelled their dismemberment, while fear of the numerous country wage-workers effectively frightened them from beginning a process that might easily prove dangerous to themselves. The great English landed aristocracy did not simply survive the revolution, it ended it by a compromise with the bourgeoisie, who had also grown tired of the domination of the small traders and manufacturers, and thereby so fortified its rulership, that to-day there is no landed aristocracy, not even that of the German provinces east of the Elbe or Hungary, which sits as firmly in the saddle as they.

Things will develop very differently in Russia, the condition of whose peasantry is practically identical in all its details with that of French peasants before the revolution. Here the result of the two revolutions will be the same to the extent that we may expect the disappearance of the present great-landed estates throughout the whole Russian kingdom and their transformation into peasant possessions. Next to the Czarism it is the landed estates with whom the revolution must balance accounts.

It is impossible to foresee what form of agricultural production will develop upon the new foundations, but one thing is certain: at this point also the Russian and the French revolutions will be alike in that the breaking up of the great private landed estates will constitute a tie that will bind the peasants indissolubly to the revolution. We do not yet know what battle of races the new revolution may conceal within its bosom, and it is easily possible that differences may arise between the peasants and the city proletariat, but the former will fight with tooth and nail to defend themselves against any revolution that seeks to re-establish the old landed regime even by foreign intervention.

This brings us to the third factor to be considered in any comparison of the three revolutions—the foreign conditions which they create.

During the 17th century international commerce was still so small that the English revolution remained a purely local event that found no echo in the remainder of Europe. It was not foreign wars, but the long drawn out civil war arising from the great power of resistance of the landed nobility, that created the revolutionary military domination, and finally led to the dictatorship of a victorious general, Cromwell.

The end of the 18th century found a well-developed commerce between European nations, and the French revolution

convulsed all Europe; but its liberating efforts found only a weak echo. The convulsion was a result of the war which the united monarchs of Europe led against the one republic and from which there rose in France military domination and the empire of a victorious general, Napoleon.

Now, at the beginning of the 20th century, international relations have become so close that the beginning of the revolution in Russia was enough to awaken the enthusiastic echo in the proletariat of the whole world, to quicken the *tempo* of the class struggle, and to shake the neighboring empire of Austria to its foundations.

As a consequence any *coalition* of European powers against the revolution, such as took place in 1793, is inconceivable. Austria is at the present moment absolutely incapable of any strong external action. In France the proletariat is already strong enough in opposition to the government to prevent any interference for Czarism, even if the ruling powers were insane enough to think of such a thing. There is no fear of a coalition against the revolution and then only one *single power* which is expected to intervene in Russia: the *German Empire*.

But even the government of the German Empire may well consider before it enters upon a war that will not be a national war, but a dynastical war and as unpopular, as hated, as that which Russia led against Japan, and which may easily draw upon the German government similar internal consequences to those which that war has brought to Russia.

Whatever may happen there is no occasion to expect an era of long world wars such as the French revolution ushered in, and accordingly we need not fear that the Russian revolution will, like the former, end in a military dictatorship, or any sort of "Holy Alliance." Its promise is rather the ushering in of an era of European revolutions that will end with the *dictatorship of the socialist society*.

KARL KAUTSKY.

Translated by A. M. Simons.

The Unemployed Agitation in England.

FROM its formation in 1881 the Social-Democratic Federation has made special efforts in the direction of agitating the question of the unemployed. It has recognized that the unemployed are a necessary and inevitable creation of capitalism, and that the solution of the question of unemployment means the downfall of the capitalist system, just as the overthrow of capitalism means the solution of the unemployed problem. In the early years of the 'eighties there was exceptional distress and in 1883 the S. D. F. formulated a set of proposals, which were then called "Practical Proposals for Pressing Needs," which included an "Eight-Hour Day," "Free Meals for School Children," "Public Construction of Workmen's Dwellings," "The State Organization of the Unemployed," etc. In the winter of 1884-1885 a vigorous agitation was carried on in most of the large industrial centers, especially in London, and in February of the latter year, a mass meeting was held on the Thames Embankment, in a drenching downpour of rain, at which speeches were delivered by H. M. Hyndman, John Burns, James Macdonald, J. E. Williams, and others. A procession was afterwards marched to the Local Government Board, and an interview took place between the heads of that department and a deputation from the demonstration. As a result of that a circular was issued by the Local Government Board advising the various local administrative bodies to do all in their power in relieving distress and in providing useful work for the unemployed.

In February of the following year, 1886, the agitation having died down in the summer and been taken up again as winter came on, the Tory "Fair Traders" or Tariff Reformers, who endeavored to put the responsibility for distress and unemployment upon free imports, sought to take the wind out of our sails and to exploit the agitation in the interest of their nostrum. They therefore called a meeting in Trafalgar Square for Monday, the 8th, and a big crowd assembled. Several well-known Socialist speakers turned up, however, and completely took the crowd away from the Fair Traders who were glad to beat a hasty retreat. As there was no organization it was difficult to disperse the meeting, and a march to Hyde Park was suggested. The suggestion was acted upon, and through the wealthiest and

most fashionable streets of the West End of London marched the ragged army of the workless and disinherited. As the crowd passed by some of the clubs they were jeered at and pelted by the inmates. That was the signal for a row. Windows were smashed, wine shops were broken into, butchers', bakers', clothiers', and jewelers' shops were sacked, and their contents distributed among the crowd, which but for the strenuous efforts of the few Socialists present would have also paid the clubmen with interest for their insolence. But the smashing of windows and looting of shops was merely an incident. The crowd passed along into the Park, held a meeting there and then peaceably dispersed.

The most remarkable thing about this whole affair was that it took place in broad daylight, in the most fashionable and wealthiest district of London, and there was no interference on the part of the authorities, the police seemed completely paralyzed and not a single arrest was made. Later, four Socialist leaders—Hyndman, Burns, Champion and Williams—were proceeded against for seditious conspiracy, and after an exhaustive trial were acquitted.

The effect of the incident was enormous. For days the well-to-do inhabitants of London were in a perfect panic; the city was in a state of siege, the chief of the Metropolitan Police was dismissed from his post, and the Mansion House Fund for the Unemployed, which up to then had only amounted to a hundred pounds, suddenly sprang up in a few days to seventy thousand pounds.

Practically every winter since then the unemployed agitation has been carried on with more or less vigor, according to circumstances. It has generally died down in the summer, and during the South African War it did not amount to much even in the winter, in consequence of the stimulus given to trade by the war. Since then, however, the unemployed problem has become more acute and the agitation has reached a new phase.

For many years it was not only the bourgeoisie, but the organized working-class—animated with bourgeois ideas—who regarded the agitation and the unemployed themselves with contempt. But we—and circumstances—have changed all that. Unemployment has become chronic; it is no longer the special feature of bad times or exceptional conditions. Trade is not bad, and our exports and imports are greater than ever before, as is also our wealth per head of population and our annual production of wealth. Yet the unemployed are more numerous than ever, and they press for attention all the year round. All through 1904 the S. D. F. was busily carrying on the agitation, and appealed for an Autumn Session of Parliament to be held to pass legisla-

tion to enable great state relief works to be put in hand. In this agitation the S. D. F. had the co-operation of the trade unions to a greater extent than ever before, and although unsuccessful in inducing the Government to hold a special Session of Parliament, at the opening of the ordinary Session in February of the present year legislation dealing with the subject was promised. That promise was redeemed by the passing of the Unemployed Workmen Act, which is, as might have been expected, an utterly worthless measure, depending upon contributions from the charitable before a single individual can be set to work. All through the year, however, the agitation has been kept going. We didn't care much for the Bill, but we did for the principle involved, and we strove to get the Bill amended. At one time the Bill, poor as it was, looked like being dropped altogether, and the Labor Representation Committee organized a demonstration on July 9 in support of that measure. It was scarcely worth the trouble, for it is proving to be quite useless. On the other hand there is little doubt that it has served to stimulate the agitation, which is growing all over the Kingdom, especially in London. Here a strong Central Workers' Committee has been formed by the London Trades Council, the S. D. F. and other bodies, representing the whole organized working-class movement of the Metropolis, and having district committees in every borough in London. Through this body Mr. Balfour was induced to receive a deputation on the 6th of the present month, when the case for the unemployed was laid before him. Although he would promise nothing but the usual sympathy and charity, there is no doubt that the deputation and demonstration have done good in calling attention to the question from other quarters. The same, also, may be said of the great demonstration and meeting in Hyde Park on Monday, 20th. That undoubtedly was the biggest unemployed demonstration that has ever been held in London and the biggest meeting of any kind held on a week day. No less than twenty-five thousand people took part in the demonstration in the park, and there were tens of thousands on the route who never got to the park at all.

In the industrial districts in the North of England, trade is improving and numbers of the unemployed are being absorbed. But that will prove but a temporary relief, and there are not, nor are there likely to be this winter, less than half a million of genuine unemployed workmen in this country, of whom at least a hundred thousand are in London. We shall persist in the agitation until something is done. We are now pressing the local authorities to put all possible useful work in hand and are demanding from the Government further legislation so that the

necessary funds for the initiation of works of public utility may be supplied from a national Exchequer instead of depending upon charity. Local demonstrations and marches are taking place daily, and we are working up for another big one to be held early in the new year. When that takes place it will be augmented, it is anticipated, by a general strike for a day. Mr. Balfour intends to extricate himself from the difficulties of his position by dissolving or resigning, but whoever may be in office something will have to be done for the unemployed, and that speedily, or there will be trouble. The popular feeling on the matter has never been so strong as at the present time. I might add that a National "Right to Work" Council has been formed, with the object of co-ordinating the agitation nationally as the Central Workers Committee has done for London. It has issued a manifesto which has been widely distributed, a copy of which I enclose.

H. QUELCH.

RIGHT TO WORK MANIFESTO. APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE.

As all workers must work in order to live, all workers have a right to demand work.

Equity demands this, since the State places heavy responsibilities upon its citizens—which can only be met by the fruits of labour—and punishes them by imprisonment and loss of citizenship when they are unable to meet these responsibilities.

Criminals and lunatics are cared for, fed, housed, clothed, and given employment by the State; for the struggling, workless worker alone nothing practical is done.

The present Government grudgingly passed the Unemployed Workmen Act, but made it practically useless for its professed object by leaving its operations dependent upon voluntary gifts.

Machinery created by national funds must not be dependent upon charity—working people resent charity and demand justice.

Further, the insulting inquisitorial questions and regulations issued by the Local Government Board for the Distress Committees, tend still further to nullify any good in the Act by appearing to make destitution and not unemployment a necessary condition before applicants can be assisted.

Want of, and desire for, work, not destitution, should be sufficient title to claim "provided work." Experience makes it clear that unemployment is not due to exceptional but to constantly-operating causes, and the Act must be so amended as to make its provisions conform to this fact.

WORKERS UNITE!

We are seeing in Russia what united action can accomplish. Shall the enfranchised workers with their wives and little ones, in this the richest nation in the world, continue to suffer in silence?

The Right to Work National Council urges the men and women of the nation to unite in a determined effort, and, in order to give strength and form to this agitation, asks the Labor and Socialist forces to promptly:—

1. Form Right to Work Committees—in co-operation with this Council—in each district where the Unemployed Workmen Act is, or should be, in operation.

2. Call upon the unemployed everywhere to register themselves and agitate their right to useful work.

3. Co-operate with this Council in organizing a national conference of elected public representatives and of Labor and Socialist organizations, to be held on the eve of the next Parliamentary Session, in order to consider how best to enforce the following demands upon the Government—

(a) The amending of the "Unemployed Workmen Act" to give power to national and local authorities to take such action as will enable them to place useful work within the reach of all applicants.

(b) The voting of the money from the National Exchequer necessary to finance the farm colonies and other works for dealing with unemployment.

(c) The putting in hand of works of utility, in order to give employment, such as afforestation, reclamation, or improvement and cultivation of land, the building of harbors of refuge, and other similar undertakings of a national character.

(d) The issuing of reasonable regulations by the Local Government Board.

Signed on behalf of the Right to Work National Council,

EXECUTIVE:

GEO. N. BARNES, Chairman.

J. KEIR HARDIE, M. P.

GEO. LANSBURY, Treasurer.

(Miss) MARY R. MACARTHUR.

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD.

EDWARD R. PEASE.

HARRY QUELCH.

(Mrs.) A. COBDEN-SANDERSON,

FRANK SMITH, Secretary.

10, Clifford's Inn, London, E. C.

Why Socialism is a Power in Russia.

IN 1891 I crossed the frontier of European Russia on my return from exile to Siberia. Being used to the respectful and courteous treatment accorded by Siberian officials to all "Political or State offenders," to all "Socialists"—I was rather disagreeably surprised by the rude and offensive behavior toward me on the part of the police-officers on the other side of the Ural. In Siberia the term "State offender" or "Socialist" was generally recognized as a title of spiritual nobility, as a key to the door of the best citizens of any community. A Socialist-exile was free to open a credit account for any amount of money with any Siberian merchant. Even the local police-officials, under whose immediate surveillance the exiles had to live, tried to appear on social terms with "the enemies of the Czar." Siberia was a sort of "Russian America." It never had any serfdom. The crushing power of the Czar was naturally felt less in the distant provinces of the huge empire.

After four years of exile in the most distant province of Eastern Siberia (Jakutsk district) I was confronted with a Police State in the worst sense of the term.

The sinister power of the reactionaries seemed to have had annihilated all opposition. Gloomy thoughts took possession of my mind. Alas, for the countless noble martyrs of Russian Freedom! Alas, for the young lives of the best sons and daughters of enslaved millions, sacrificed on the bloody altar of the moloch of Czardom! Alas, for the ruined careers of the high-minded champions of the most sublime ideals of humanity, the ideals of Socialism! They seemed to have sacrificed their noble lives in vain. It was a time of dark despair for me, and I left my unfortunate country with no hope for a better future for it for a long, long time to come.

Fourteen years passed—a mere moment in the life of a nation—and the Russian revolution concentrated, in one year, historical events of centuries. The apparently impregnable rock of absolutism has crumbled into dust and ashes before our very eyes. The stolid State-Church of Russia, the servile hand-maid of the government, has lost its paralyzing hold on the masses of the people. Even the army, the last and chief reliance of tyranny and oppression, is permeated with the spirit of sedition. The Russian people, who suffered slavery during centuries, suddenly

awake from their lethargy to a vivid realization of their rights and their power to demand, to command and to conquer.

How and why did it happen?

This is a question naturally asked by non-Russians, who fail to grasp the deeper significance of world movements.

Indeed, the gospel of romantic Socialism was preached to the common people, the peasants, since their emancipation from serfdom, almost half a century ago. The revolutionists tried to make the ideas and ideals developed in modern industrial countries palatable by idealizing the archaic common tenure of land (*mir*) as the rock, on which a new state of society could be built. The romantic Socialists claimed, that the "*mir*" will allow the Russian people to leap from medievalism to Socialism across the chasm of capitalism, and in this way to avoid the horrors which fall to the modern industrial proletariat. But the peasants, reared in an atmosphere of patriarchal despotism, remained politically inert and economically dormant. The "*mir*" was doomed to dissolution. Capitalism developed and grew. The revolutionists were crushed by the cyclopean hammer of absolutism on the anvil of inertia of the agricultural masses. Russia was always the classical land of the Overman—the social-economic and political parasite. Nietzsche's philosophical ravings were realized in Russia to the letter. Nietzsche did not know Russia's Overmen and the Russian "Overmen" hardly knew Nietzsche. But "*les beaux esprits se rencontrent!*" Judge for yourself. Here is Nietzsche's definition of life, which is a true picture of Russian conditions. "Life is essentially appropriation, injury, overthrow of foreign and weaker elements (i. e., Poles, Finns, Jews, etc.), oppression, hardness, the forcing of one's own forms upon others (Russianization of Poland, Finland, etc.), the incorporation and at least exploitation, to put it mildly, of foreign elements." The Russian Overmen "tramples under foot the despicable kind of well-being of which grocers, Christians, cows, women, Englishmen and other democrats dream," just as Nietzsche prescribed.

The Russian "Overmen" agree with Nietzsche that, "There is no more venomous poison than the doctrines of equality, for it seems to be preached by justice itself, when in fact it is the end of justice."

"The essential characteristic of every good and healthy aristocracy is that it does not regard itself as the function of the community, but as its aim and higher justification, that it accepts with a good conscience the sacrifice of countless numbers of human beings who must for its sake be degraded into incomplete men, slaves, tools." So spake Zarathustra, as if he were trying to compete with Mr. Stead in glorifying the "White Czar" (Athustra?) with bloody hands.

As a master of serfs, as an official of the crown, as a priest the Russian Overmen recognize no law except their animal desires, their appetites and self-indulgence. The singular passivity and servility of the peasantry offered no obstacle to the development of the wildest type of an Overman. The Czar was the Overman of all Overmen, the Overman *par excellence*. The granddukes were Overmen only second to the Czar. Then followed the various members of the bureaucracy, beginning with the highest officers of the state and ending with the obscurest of all village-policemen. All Overmen were destined by benevolent providence to consume the very substance of the deeply despised common people, the "Undermen."

The situation seemed to be hopeless for the friend of Russian Freedom. It appeared to be a vicious circle, in which the Overman and Underman, the bureaucrat and the peasant (other classes did not count at all), would revolve forever.

Fortunately, the laws of social-economies caused the transformation of the meek and lowly agrarian proletarian into a class-conscious industrial proletarian. The Underman turned into a man in overalls. This was a historical event of the utmost import to Russia. The Underman-peasant could not get Socialism into his thick skull. The man in overalls took to Socialism as a duck to water. He was eager to absorb the message of Socialism, the message of his salvation. The Overman-bureaucrat fostered capitalism with all his might, not suspecting in the least, that he was digging his own grave.

The Overman never dreamed, that the simple act of putting on overalls would change the very nature of the Underman. It was a revelation and a revolution at the same time. Capitalism prepared the soil for a Socialist Party. The heavy yoke of absolutism compelled the Russian Socialists to live and act clandestinely "under-ground." Such a life and activity dwarfed the mind of many a revolutionist to a pitiable extent and limited their organization to a number of loosely-connected circles.

This system naturally resulted in the development of petty personal conflicting ambitions, jealousies, misunderstandings and general confusion of tactics and principles. Insignificant divergencies of opinions concerning insignificant points of tactics were artificially magnified into cardinal differences of vital principles of Socialism. Great minds fritted away their subtle powers in petty personal bickerings and heresy hunting. (*Tout comme chez nous!*) But the Russian Social-Democratic literature displayed an originality of thought, a philosophic depth, a soberness and maturity of judgment, not to be met with in any other Socialist literature except the German.

The theoretical soundness of the Russian Social-Democrats proved of great advantage to them when the time for action arrived. They rapidly gained the confidence of the workingmen and lead from one victory to another by purely peaceful methods.

So today we see the proletarians, a class in all not exceeding three millions—a mere insignificant fraction of the entire population of Russia—the arbiters of the destinies of their country. Comparatively small in numbers, unorganized, economically poor, unschooled—the Russian men in overalls command the admiration of the world by their fearlessness and solidarity in the face of a crafty, unscrupulous, corrupt and cruel foe.

The proletariat have turned a political revolt into a Socialist revolution. The youngest child of the International proletarian movement finds itself in the front rank of militant Socialist parties. The Russian proletariat has no scabs. Solidarity, brotherhood are not mere words for them. They have no reserve funds to back them up in their death and life struggle, no presidents to intervene for them, no Judas-leaders. To go out on a strike means to them to actually starve with their families, to be maimed, crippled or killed by Cossacks, to be imprisoned for life, to be buried alive in the snows of Siberia for the cause of class, their people, their country. The plain men in overalls shame into political honesty and uncompromising radicalism their intellectual brothers in broadcloth, who are rather inclined to bargaining in politics as well as in economics. The proletarians make up the real backbone of the Russian revolution. The Russian revolution would collapse the moment the men in overalls withdrew, in spite of all the fine speeches of the top-heavy orators of the liberals and reformers in various congresses and assemblies. Only as long as the proletariat is ready and willing to suffer and to die for the Co-operative Commonwealth, do half-hearted liberals dare to demand political reforms from the Czar's government.

Russia is not ripe for the Co-operative Commonwealth—this is a truism. But the proletariat cannot and will not be satisfied with anything short of a Co-operative Commonwealth. History proves, that political liberty and democracy are but a snare and delusion without economic liberty and democracy. The advance guard of the proletarian revolutionists knows, that for the immediate future the middle class Overmen will reap the benefit of the men in overalls. But this is no reason why the Social-Democrats of Russia should relinquish even for a moment their logical, uncompromising attitude.

The Russian proletariat profited by the lessons of history. The Russian proletariat learned to mistrust the Overmen of all

description, even when they offer wooden-horse presents in the shape of liberal reforms. The Russian workingman cannot be sold out by the middle-class liberals, for the simple reason that they cannot deliver the goods.

The Russian proletariat teaches the proletariat of the world how to struggle and win the battle against political and economic anarchy and oppression.

Is it possible, is it probable, that the lesson of the Russian Socialist revolution will be of no avail to the proletariat of the world?

Is it possible, is it probable, that the German Socialists will keep on tolerating a Kaiser Wilhelm, an arrogant military despot with medieval proclivities—indefinitely?

Will the French Socialists allow reactionaries and plutocrats to run the republic to their heart's delight for a long time to come?

Will the English workingmen persist in ignoring the political end of the class struggle for many years more?

Will the American laborers, skilled or unskilled, remain blind to the real nature of their blind leaders of the pure and simple trade union variety?

All signs of the time point toward a social-economic upheaval all the world over.

The flames of the Russian Social revolution are already throwing sparks into Germany and Austria, the next door neighbors of the Czar. The sparks are likely to burst into a mighty conflagration enveloping all civilized countries, including the United States.

Let us, Social-Democrats, be prepared for it. Let us study the great problems of the age and preach our gospel with the zeal and inspiration of apostles and with the tolerance of thinkers and scientists.

ISADOR LADOFF.

The Situation in Hungary.

STUDENTS of political questions everywhere, while keeping their eyes on the land of the "little father" and his many troubles with the gigantic revolution on his hands, should not overlook Hungary the land of many revolutions. This, the country of Magyars, is now on the verge of a great change. The political pot is overboiling there and the ruling powers have a grave question to face.

In striving to sum up the Hungarian crisis it would be well to give the reader an idea of the country, its economic condition, and the political complexion of the people, so that the reader will have some material to aid him in judging the situation and to seek its probable outcome.

Hungary is under the dominion of the Austrian Empire. The form of government is a sort of a limited monarchy. Franz Joseph is the emperor of Austria, also the king of Hungary. The nation is composed mainly of a mixture of a Slav, Gypsy and the original Magyar stem. The people have always had a revolutionary tendency. On more than one occasion they have risen to overthrow a kingdom and to establish a republican form of government. In the year 1848, Louis Kossuth led a revolution for the entire separation of Hungary from Austrian dominion and the establishment of a republic to be patterned after the United States of America. So far, every attempt has been a failure. Kossuth and the leaders were seized and imprisoned. The first president of a Hungarian Republic was captured in Budapest and the dream of a republic faded away after one month's existence. Budapest is the capital, with a population of about 600,000. Judging the country from an economic standpoint, it is just awakening. Industry is yet in a crude state of a beginning. Agricultural pursuits lead, but as with everything else the tools are as yet very simple, old fashioned and undeveloped. Feudalism is breathing its last and modern commercialism is beginning to find its way. The larger portion of the available farm lands is owned by Barons or Counts, who lease it to small farmers, or better still and more profitable, allow the laborers to work the land on shares or for meager wages.

Budapest is the largest city, but unlike the American metropolis, it contains no large factory or department store, no loud yellow journals, and very few if any real "captains of industry."

Probably the largest employer in Budapest is Andre Thek, manufacturer of pianos and furniture, who employs 200 women and children, and about 500 men.

The country is mainly governed by a House of Deputies, who are elected by popular vote; the proletariat as usual having no voice in the matter. A strict property qualification is necessary in order to entitle a citizen to the right of a ballot.

Woman suffrage is unknown. The professional class—physicians, lawyers, teachers, college professors and ministers—is entitled to a ballot. In the narrow sense of the term, no actual laborer has a ballot in Hungary. He is, however, compelled to serve three years in the army. He is drilled and taught to shoot his fellowman, but he is not permitted to say who shall make his laws, or what they shall be. He has no right to question or to think. He simply obeys.

The last political complexion of Hungary was as follows:

Liberal Party, 200 deputies.

Independent Party, 80 deputies.

Democratic Party, 1 deputy.

Social-Democratic Party, no deputies.

At the last elections, from January 26 to February 2, the political complexion was changed and the Socialists elected 2 members of the House of Deputies. The Liberal Party is the government party and in every respect resembles the Republican party of the United States. The Independent Party is composed mainly of dissatisfied office seekers and representatives of the very small business interests. It is an exact picture of the Democratic party of the United States. The Hungarian Democratic Party is a sort of a small reform one-man element, headed by Dr. Varzsonyi Wilmos, member of the House of Deputies. I had the pleasure of luncheon with this leader during my stay in Budapest and had a long political chat with the doctor. He is a lawyer by profession, and claims he is a "Socialist too." He is a good combination of the two American Willies—Bryan and Hearst. He believes firmly in government ownership, but not in collectivism. He does not pretend to be a Marxist. In the heat of our lengthy discussion he admitted that he was trying to use the socialist thunder and said that if universal suffrage were to be introduced at least 100 Socialists would be speaking on the floor of the governing body. That portion of the working class of Hungary who live in cities is well organized into trade unions, which are working harmoniously together with the great political movement of the proletariat, the Social Democratic Party of Hungary.

The success of the revolutionary movement in Russia has

stirred them, together with other radical elements of the dual Hapsburg Empire, and has given them the impetus to demand above all, universal suffrage. Demonstration after demonstration has stirred the country and a number of times within the past year, the windows of the House of Deputies met many a disaster from the stones thrown by the marching multitudes. What the outcome of the present crisis will be no one can clearly tell at this writing.¹ One thing is certain, and that is that the "hot-blooded Magyar" is up and doing. He desires universal and equal suffrage, and eventually he will attain it. The newly-elected Hungarian Parliament will have been assembled² when this article reaches the press and some wonderful battles are to be expected. The general opinion of the Hungarian press is, that if the disturbances become too threatening a remarkable program will be offered by a representative of the crown. Just one year ago, this supposed program would have been regarded as madness. It is said to include besides universal suffrage and compulsory education, a graduated income tax, a redivision of the lands of the church and state into small farms to be let out on long leases, an agricultural banking credit system, limitations on the labor of women and children, old age and health insurance, and improved housing conditions of the working class. Of course, it is also said to include increased protection for manufacturers and the usual condition, viz., that the foreign relations be left in the hands of Franz Joseph. The question, on the point of the use of language in the army is to be settled by the coming session of the House of Deputies.

The Socialists are putting up a noble fight through the usual methods of education agitation and demonstrations for universal suffrage, separation of church and state, universal and free education, and free speech and press. The opposition consists of two reactionary factions, who seem to be divided on such petty matters as the use of language in the army, etc., but the working class cannot be mislead by such chaff. The opposition consists of the following leaders:

Francis Kossuth, a supposed reformer, but without his father's eloquence. Count Kossuth is a tactful politician, always seeking compromise.

Desidarius Banffy, former prime minister, is a radical until compromise is possible. An ambitious man.

Count Albert Apponyi, although a strict conservative (his father was chancellor during the absolutism), is the leader of one faction of the opposition urging the separation of the two countries, but the retention of the king. They desire the "In-

1. December 17, 1906.

2. Parliament assembles at Budapest, Dec 19, 1906.

dependence of Hungary" in the shape of separate commercial and diplomatic representatives only, and probably the use of the mother tongue in the army.¹

I must not forget Count Julius Andrassy (son of the late prime minister), an ambitious fellow, who, though he lacks ability as a leader, is very successful through his important family position. Truly the Hungarians are groping in the darkness. They have no lack of leaders both false and true. There are those who take advantage of the patriotic fever of the people and strive to guide it in the misleading channel of so-called "48 Kossuth patriotism." At this writing it is impossible to prophecy the outcome. A very large portion of the people are illiterate and can easily be misled. Then, again, economic conditions are such that even if the Magyar awakens to find himself in a republic he would have to turn "face about" and with new weapons and methods he would have to follow the advanced nations and fight his new enemy, the bourgeoisie, for control of the tools of wealth production. While in the past his patriotic zeal has been awakened by the cry:

"Isten ald meg a magyart,"

we now behold him marching to the tune of the "Munkas Mar-seillaise." From all appearances, if his present spirit keeps apace with the times, in the near future he is sure to surprise some of the wise political economists of the present day by carrying battles instead of mere skirmishes by a new cry which will mean victory to the proletariat:

"Világ Proletarjai egyesüljeteK."

Cincinnati, Ohio.

NICHOLAS KLEIN.

1. The Hungarian army was created in 1715.

Materialism in its Relation to Socialism and Progress.

THE THESIS.

THE thesis which I am to maintain and the materialist confute is expressed in the following propositions:

1. Materialism fails utterly to furnish us a rational and intelligible explanation of the cosmos, including both the so-called physical and mental phenomena.

2. Granting the fundamental postulates of materialism for the sake of argument, they lead logically and inevitably to the most rigid determinism, eliminating choice and will from the powers of the individual.

3. Without the power of choice the individual can have no responsibility for his acts; nor can there be any reason why any individual, or any set of individuals, should attempt to change the course of events, or even to control his own acts; hence, reform, socialism, and all progress are chimerical, the individual being but an impotent gazer into the kaleidoscope of the universe, which pictures the eternal flux of matter.

METAPHYSICAL CHARACTER OF THE ARGUMENT.

The argument here set forth is metaphysical in the sense that it applies the test of rationality to the data of science; and in this sense of the term there can be no basis of philosophy other than a metaphysical one. Some controversialists affect to hold metaphysics in contempt; and the quibbles of medieval dialectics are worthy of being so held. But the reaction against dialecticism was not so much because of faulty reasoning, as that the dialecticians closed their eyes to obvious facts and accepted authority in their stead. Reasoning thus from false premises their conclusions were often erroneous. This fault of medieval and Aristotelian philosophy can not be charged to metaphysics. And I will say at the outset that I can have no controversy with one who says that two and two may be five in some other corner of the universe, or who denies the validity of logical and mathematical axioms.

GENERAL VIEW OF PHILOSOPHY.

The scope of philosophy is so broad that but a mere outline view can be taken of its field in a discussion of this character.

It includes all phenomena—both the mental and physical so-called; and its discussions appear under so many different names and forms that, for clearness, I will give in brief the various classifications from different view points.

First, we may discuss phenomena from the view point of the *esse* (essence, substance). From this view point there are three views, resulting in three corresponding systems of philosophy, namely, Materialism, Dualism, and Idealism.

Materialism holds that a something which we call matter, having certain unchangeable powers and properties, is in space and eternal in time; that all phenomena which we know are merely the activities, or functions, of this matter.

Dualism holds that there are two kinds of reality to be considered in the universe, matter and mind, so entirely different in their properties and functions, each in a different order of existence from the other, that neither can give us any account or explanation of the other.

Idealism holds that the only reality which we know or can know is the mind and its states; and for the reason that knowledge cannot extend to other orders of existence we have no right to assume them.

Second, from the view point of the nexus of matter and mind, their relations in space and time, we have Automatism, Interactionism, and Parallelism.

Automatism regards all phenomena as the spontaneous motion in matter, or matter in motion, including the ether as matter in the broadest sense of the latter term. Thus mind is a mode of motion, as sound, heat, light, and electricity, of gross matter or the all-pervading ether.

Interactionism views all phenomena of mind in its relation to matter, as the action of mind upon matter and of matter upon mind.

Parallelism views mind and matter as two separate streams of phenomena, corresponding events of mind and matter (as thought and brain movement) as synchronous, neither occurring prior to the other; and also that they are without causal nexus—that neither can have the relation of cause or effect to the other.

Third, we may look upon all phenomena from the view point of origin—the First Cause, and we have Atheism, Monotheism, Polytheism, and Pantheism. These terms are sufficiently definite and well understood as to require no explanation here.

Fourth, we may consider events, whether mental or physical, from the view point of cause alone, and we have Determinism and Libertarianism.

Determinism denies that there can be any free will, or choice, by the individual; that every act of the individual is the resultant

of a multitude of forces acting in and upon him, while mind is the impotent witness of the act.

Predestinarianism and Fatalism must be classed under the head of Determinism, though the one is based on the authority of scripture and the other on superstition, and they are thus not derived by any scientific or logical process.

Libertarianism, or Indeterminism, on the contrary, asserts that the individual will, when several lines of action are presented to it, two or more of which tempt the will, has the power of choice from among the several alternatives presented.

Fifth, we may look upon all acts of the individual from the view point of motives, and we have Hedonism (also called Utilitarianism and Egoism) and Intuitionism.

Hedonism regards every act of the individual as done from the motive of self-gratification, or happiness. Egoism, also, is the doctrine of selfishness; while Utilitarianism is the same doctrine hidden under a term of somewhat different meaning. Utilitarianism holds that every act of the individual is performed with the utility of the act only in view. But it must be observed that the utility meant is that to the individual himself, and not to others; the utilitarian theory is therefore identical with that of hedonism and egoism.

Intuitionism holds that the human mind grasps certain axioms and criteria of action immediately (both of intellectual and moral quality), and that it acts from a consideration of these criteria. Altruism, which teaches service to others in forgetfulness of self, is a corollary of intuitionism.

There are some other isms which cannot, perhaps, be brought strictly under the foregoing classification; as, for example, the phenomenalism of Huxley, who starts from the idealist's position, and, by an impossible leap, goes to the materialist's conclusion. The foregoing classification, however, while not strictly exclusive, is sufficient for our purpose—to give us the lay of the land in the philosophic world.

ULTIMATE CONSTITUTION OF MATTER.

The first failure of materialism is in the utter failure of its advocates to give us a rational theory of the constitution of matter. The theory of Dalton is so crude and irrational that it has been abandoned by all scientists, except as to its convenience as a working hypothesis, without the possibility of its having any element of truth in it. Action at a distance in accordance with different laws (those of gravitation and molecular attractions and repulsions) are insuperable difficulties which the Dalton theory of atoms cannot overcome.

The Ionisation theory of matter has been more recently propounded, and it has found favor in certain quarters. But instead of removing the difficulties of the atomic theory, it multiplies them. It takes the mystery of the substance of matter, the mystery of a wave motion in a mysterious ether with impossible or inconceivable properties, and, above all, a mysterious polarization of the ions, and puts them together for an explanation of matter. Such a theory makes too many assumptions and encounters too many difficulties to make it worthy of serious consideration.

The theory of vortex atoms worked out by Helmholtz and Sir William Thomson is an improvement, at least, upon the atomic theory of Dalton, in that it does explain in a way phenomena that no other theory yet proposed can explain. This theory assumes a vortex ring motion in a perfect fluid,—such a fluid being defined as without viscosity, incompressible, and homogeneous. Thomson demonstrated mathematically that a vortex motion once set up in such a fluid must always persist. He showed that vortex rings in such a fluid would have many of the properties required for an atomic theory,—attractions, repulsions, inertia, or mass, and elasticity. The infolding, or looping, of the ring is made to explain the different kinds of matter with their differing atomic weights. Yet this theory meets with many difficulties, which in the present state of our knowledge are unexplainable. The vortex ring theory requires a perfect fluid whose particles move over each other without friction. The transmission of light and electricity through the ether at the known velocity of light requires that the ether be of a jellylike consistency with a coefficient of rigidity of 842.8; or, as compared to steel, as one to 1,000,000,000. Again, vortex atoms require an incompressible fluid; but the phenomena of light and electricity require an ether of definite compressibility and elasticity. It thus appears that the properties required by the vortex atom theory are not such as mathematicians have shown that the ether must possess. Are we to suppose then that there are two ethers, one for vortex atoms and the other for the transmission of light, heat, and electricity? If so, these two ethers must occupy the same space at the same time, which is impossible. We must conclude from what precedes that mass (inertia of matter), gravitation, and all molecular attractions and repulsions of matter are unexplainable by any theory of the constitution of matter yet propounded.

But we will pass, for argument, the difficulties arising out of the inadequacy of our theories of the constitution of matter, and assume that they have been overcome, to point out a few

difficulties in harmonizing the fundamental materialistic conceptions.

MATERIALISTIC CONCEPTIONS CANNOT BE HARMONIZED WITH FACTS.

Materialistic philosophers have eliminated all such notions as force, life, and mind, holding that they are mere modes of motion of matter or the ether. They hold that but five fundamental concepts are required to explain all phenomena. The absolute concepts of space and time need not be considered here. The other three are matter, ether, and motion. Some physicists object to placing ether and matter in the same category, holding that matter itself is but a mode of motion of the ether, in which case there is but ether in motion as the last analysis of all phenomena. But for the purpose of our argument there can be no objection to classifying the ether and matter together as different forms of the same thing, reducing our fundamental conceptions to four; hence the dictum: "In the last analysis all phenomena are but matter in motion." And the corollary is: "All motion is to be considered in its relations to fixed points in space and time." These dicta may be said to represent fairly the materialistic foundation of philosophy. And the difference between the materialist and all other philosophers is indicated and admirably expressed by Professor William James in the alternative question: Are all phenomena motions due to *vis a tergo* (a push from behind); or may some motions be due to *vis a fronte* (a pull, or a leading on from before)? The materialist must choose the former of the two alternatives and reach a mechanical, invariant result. The latter leaves room for mind, choice, free will.

A PARADOX OF PHYSICS AND MECHANICS.

The physicist tells you that there is a fixed amount of matter and a fixed amount of motion in the universe; also that the amount of energy (which is merely matter in motion) is fixed, since energy is a function of matter and motion only. He tells you that the amount of motion of a body is expressed by the formula $M = mv$, while the energy of a body is expressed by the formula $E = \frac{1}{2} mv^2$. Let us see how these formulas harmonize. We will take first, for example, two billiard balls, which we will suppose to be of equal mass and perfectly elastic. Let one be set in motion with a velocity of two. Let it collide with the other in such a manner as to communicate one-half its motion. Then each will move with a velocity of one. The momentum before collision is two, and the energy also two. After collision the momentum is two, but the energy is one unit only. Query.

What has become of the one unit of energy which has disappeared? Some one will say it has been transformed into molecular motion of heat. Practically some energy is so transformed into heat. Again, in the case supposed there is no loss of motion by collision, and the energy which has disappeared cannot be dependent on motion, since the motion of our system has been neither increased nor diminished. Once more, let us premise a system of 1,000 molecules of gas, in which all molecules are at rest but one, which has a velocity of 1,000. Taking the mass of a molecule as unity, our system has 1,000 units of momentum and 500,000 units of energy. If the one molecule communicates its motion to the other molecules, collision continuing until all move with equal velocity, then all will move with a velocity of 1. The momentum after collision will be 1,000, but the energy will be reduced to 500. Query. What has become of the 499,500 units of energy which have disappeared? In the one case 1,000 units of motion stand for 500,000 units of energy, while in the other the same amount of motion stands for but 500 units of energy. Here, then, are 499,500 units of energy which do not represent any motion whatever; it can not be matter in motion. It must appear, without further discussion, that any system of bodies moving with varying or unequal velocities must suffer a loss of energy on distribution of motion equally to the bodies in proportion to mass; i. e., so that all bodies in the system move with equal velocities. Query. Do we have conservation of energy in the universe or conservation of motion? We cannot have both; and if there is a conservation of energy and not of motion, then motion appears and disappears which is not attended by a corresponding appearance and disappearance of energy. On the other hand, if there is a conservation of motion and not of energy, then energy appears and disappears without any corresponding appearance and disappearance of motion.

Physicists have not yet given us any explanation of this paradox, and it would appear that no explanation can be given, if we assume that energy is merely matter in motion.

MYSTERY OF POTENTIAL ENERGY, GRAVITY, ETC.

Again, a weight is raised to an elevation and brought to rest. Query. What has become of the energy which disappeared in raising the weight? The physicist says it has become potential; but this is merely a term employed to hide his ignorance as to what has become of the energy. All motion disappeared as the body came to rest at the elevation. Here again is energy which is not matter in motion. In what does the potential energy consist? It has been suggested that the ether, being comparable

to a piece of India rubber, is placed in a state of stress by two bodies moving apart in it, which stress tends to bring the bodies together. But this explanation explains too much; for the moving of bodies in any direction should produce a like stress, and the moving of the bodies toward each other should cause a compression of the ether, thus giving the bodies a tendency to repulsion instead of attraction. This is contrary to all experience, and the explanation fails. Again, LeSage proposed a flow in every direction of "ultramundane corpuscles" moving with the velocity of light. The corpuscles impinge on gross matter and cause bodies to approach each other, since each body shields every other in the line joining their centers. The relations of mass and velocity of the corpuscles have been computed to explain gravity by the law of inverse squares, also the transmission of light, heat, and electricity. If these phenomena were all requiring explanation, the theory of LeSage would be entitled to credence, combining it with that of vortex atoms. We might suppose the ether to consist of these corpuscles, each corpuscle being a simple vortex ring, while matter is composed of involutioned and knotted vortex-ring atoms. By this means we have a plausible (or possible rather) explanation of gravity and transmission of radiant energy. But for chemism and other molecular and interatomic forces it is entirely powerless to afford an explanation.

MATERIALISTIC ASSUMPTIONS AND MATHEMATICAL PROBABILITIES.

But for argument let us grant the materialist his atoms, his ether, gravitation, and molecular and interatomic attractions and repulsions, impossible of explanation though they be. What next does he demand? He admits of no design in the universe—no Creator; but asserts that all grows out of the blind, fortuitous clash of his atoms. He demands atoms exactly alike. Every hydrogen atom in the universe must be just like every other hydrogen atom; every oxygen atom just like every other oxygen atom; and so on through our seventy or more elements. And all this out of blind chance! If we examine shot which are formed into globules as the molten metal falls from the tower, we find every gradation of size from the smallest to the largest, within the limits determined by the holes in the colander through which it is poured and the height of the tower. By a process of screening they are separated into different numbers approximately of the same size; but the chances are greatly against any two being exactly of the same shape, size, and weight. But of the infinite number of atoms in the universe, we must have them divided into about seventy classes, and all in each class exactly of the same size, mass, valency, and other properties such that when we know one we know all. But granting that the one chance in an infinity of possible cases has happened, the fortuitous becom-

ing of matter should leave us no gaps in the series of the elements. Hydrogen's atomic weight is 1. We should have an element whose atomic weight should differ from that of hydrogen by an infinitesimal quantity, and so on until the gap between 0 and 1 is filled with an infinite series of elements; and that between hydrogen and lithium with another infinite series of elements; that between lithium and glucinum with another infinite series of elements, and so on until we reach lead with an atomic weight of 206.4. Yet more; we should not stop there; we should have elements beyond with higher atomic weights. We can see no reason why chance should stop with lead as the element of the highest atomic weight which it can produce; but there is, on the contrary, every reason why the series should be continued right on infinitely, if we treat the matter as a problem in probabilities, as we must. Why a mere seventy elements? Why a mere thousand, a mere million, or a mere any-number-which-we-can-express? We think we have discovered in matter certain powers of combining in multiple proportions, which power we term valency, or quantivalence. We have valencies of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. But why stop there? Why is not our system of valencies continued beyond? Why not to a thousand, or a million? Many other questions quite as pertinent, to be drawn from the chemical and physical properties of matter, bring forth no answer from the materialist; they can have no answer but in the assumption of an intelligent Creator, or the assumption of one Infinite Intelligence and Power of which all other intelligences and powers are individualized fragments. If it be credulity to assume an Infinite Power and Intelligence; yet it is the one assumption which is able to rationalize all phenomena; while the materialist's position leads him into absurdities and impossibilities at every step of the way as we pass from the atom up to the highest forms of life and intelligence.

In my next article I shall consider briefly the difficulties to be encountered in passing from matter to life, and the utterly impassable gulf between matter and mind on any other than a dualistic or idealistic foundation in philosophy.

CHAS. H. CHASE.

A Hero of the Russian Revolution.

THERE took place on the 20th of October in the city of Sebastopol an extraordinary funeral attended by almost the entire population. It was the occasion of the burial of those peaceful citizens who on the night of the publication of the Imperial Manifesto of liberation to prisoners sought peaceably to carry this news of freedom to the prisoners and were shot down by the troops. In spite of the tens of thousands who had assembled the order at the grave was remarkable. The energetic objections of the municipal representatives had succeeded in keeping away the military and police.

After the dead had been given over to the earth and the speeches of the Mayor and other prominent citizens were finished Lieut. of Marines Schmidt stepped forward to the grave. His appearance aroused the greatest interest in the thick mass who had peopled the neighboring hillocks with thousands of uncovered heads. During the last few days Schmidt had become well known as a political agitator and worker for freedom. Although not a member of the City Council he had been invited by the Mayor to take part in the sessions and the advice which he had given there had brought him great popularity among the workers.

As the silence of the grave extended throughout the people this speaker, exhausted by continued tireless agitation, began to speak with a low but deeply impressive voice:

"Only prayers are thought to be fitting at the grave, but the words of love and the sacred consecration which I wish to lay upon you here have much in common with a prayer. When the joy at the rising sun of freedom filled the souls of those sleeping ones around whose grave we stand their first impulse was to hasten with all rapidity to those who lay in prison, because of their efforts for freedom and who therefore in this hour of universal rejoicing found themselves robbed of this greatest good. Taking with them the message of joy they hastened to the prisoners. They sought to set them free, and for this were murdered. They wished to share that highest good of life—freedom—and therefore were themselves robbed of life. What a hideous crime, what an immeasurable and useless sorrow! Now their souls look down upon us and dumbly question 'What will you do with this good of which we have been forever deprived? How will you

use your freedom? Can you promise us that we shall be the last sacrifice of despotism; and if we would give peace to these restless souls we must swear that we will do this, I swear to them" rang out his voice, "That we will never yield a hand's breadth of the human rights that we have already conquered. I swear to this" said the speaker with upraised hand. I swear to this" rang back the many thousand voices. "We swear before them that we will devote our whole strength, our whole soul, our whole life to the attainment of freedom. I swear this." "I swear this," repeated the host. "We swear before them that we will devote our whole strength and our whole life absolutely to the working class! I swear this." "I swear it," sounded back from the assemblage amid sobs. "We swear that there shall no longer be among us Jews, nor Armenians, nor Poles, nor Tartars, but from now on only equal, free brothers, of a great free Russia," and once more the people shouted back "I swear this." "We swear that we will follow this thing to its end, until we have attained universal, equal suffrage for all." "I swear to this," came back. There no longer stood before the people simply a speaker, but a mighty tribune, whom the ten-thousand-headed mass were ready to follow. "We swear before them," and the words fell from the lips of the speaker, as though cut from steel, "That if universal suffrage is not given to us we will proclaim once more the general strike throughout all Russia. I swear to this" concluded the speaker "I swear it" rolled like thunder over the earth.

The speaker had finished. He was kissed, embraced, a simple soldier threw himself upon his neck, forgetting all discipline, and the official rank of the speaker. Schmidt disappeared among the people. That same evening he was arrested on the order of the Commanding General, Tschuchin, and placed upon the battle ship "Tri Swatitjelja" as a prisoner. Six days later the red banner of the revolution waved above that battleship.

Translated from the Berlin "Vorwaerts" by A. M. Simons.

The Marxian Theory of Value and Surplus Value.

Continued.

WE have seen in the last article the baselessness of the chief objection to Marx's analysis by which he comes to labor as the "common something" of all the commodities which must be the cause and measure of value. The objections noted in that article, while the most important, are not, however, the only ones. There are other objections urged against this analysis by Böhm-Bawerk himself, as well as by the noted German economist, Professor Carl Diehl, not to speak of our old acquaintances L. Slonimski and Professor Masaryk. In this article an attempt will be made to exhaust the list and to pay our respects to all of them but one, which will be pointed out, and that one will not be considered here for the reason that certain other phases of the Marxian theory must be explained before the objection and the answer thereto can be properly appreciated. This task will, therefore, be left for the next article, which will be specially devoted to it. We refer here to the so-called "Great Contradiction" between the Marxian Theory of value and the theory of the Uniform Rate of Interest. Incidentally, we will have occasion to examine into the supposed contradictions between the first and third volumes of "Capital."

In discussing these objections we will have to pursue the course adopted by us of following more or less closely on the heels of Böhm-Bawerk, except where others specifically require our attention.

The first objection to be noted here is, that Marx's analysis must, of necessity, be faulty, for the reason that the field of his investigation was not broad enough; that he did not take as the subject of his analysis all "goods" which may be the subject of exchange, but only "commodities," that is, goods created by labor. It is claimed that by thus limiting his analysis from the outset to the products of labor only, he prejudged the case and forced the result of leaving labor as the only "common something," and that if the analysis were to be made on all exchange-

able "goods" the result would be different. As Böhm-Bawerk puts it:—Marx purposely puts into the sieve only those things which can get through it. And he adds:—"Marx is careful not to give us any explicit statement of the fact that, and the reason why, he began his *investigation*, by excluding therefrom a part of the goods possessing exchange-value."

It will be noticed that Böhm-Bawerk does not use the word, "analysis" but "investigation." This is one instance of the careless use of terms for which *all* Marx critics are well noted. While seemingly a mere trifle, this interchange of words is, in reality, a matter of quite some importance. An analysis is a purely logical operation used as a means to show the logical counterpart of some actual phenomenon. It serves to formulate by bringing into play our powers of abstract reasoning, a general conception of the mass of particular facts. While, therefore, analysis is a helpful means in arriving at a generalization, it is no *proof* of its correctness. On the contrary, it is the correctness of the generalization that is usually the best proof of the faultlessness of the analysis. The mastery of a subject will be shown by the ability to recognize which phenomena are most typical for the subject-matter under consideration. But this can not be found out from the analysis itself, but must be gathered from outside sources. The best proof of the typicalness of the phenomena selected for analysis is usually obtainable only after the analysis has been completed, the generalization obtained, and the stage of *proving* the generalization arrived at. The proof of the generalization, if the same be correct, will itself reveal these typical phenomena.

(Just as, to borrow an example from another province of science, in order to obtain a correct idea as to the chemical composition of water, we must not analyze as many sorts of water as possible, but on the contrary, one sort of it, the most typical, that is,—*pure unalloyed water*.) Any analysis will, therefore, be justifiable, which will serve this purpose, of arriving at a proper generalization. In making the analysis, therefore, we must not be guided by the "equitable" claims of different phenomena to be analyzed, but merely by the one consideration: the analysis of what facts will best serve the purpose for which the analysis is undertaken. Usually, it is not the analysis of the greatest number of phenomena but of the most typical phenomena that will serve the purpose best.

We have already seen in a preceding article that Marx had ample historical and logical *justification* and *warrant* to assume that the factory product was the most typical of the exchange-value-possessing commodity, and therefore, the most proper subject for his analysis. The *proof*, however, of the correctness of

his assumption is furnished by the same facts which prove the generalization which is the result of the analysis. For, as we have already stated before, Marx does not depend on this analysis, nor on any other purely logical operation, to prove his theory, but on the facts themselves. In order, however, that the facts should prove anything, all the facts had to be examined and *investigated*. And if Böhm-Bawerk's statement were true that Marx did not include in his *investigation* all "goods" possessing exchange-value, his theory would remain unproven,—and if the excluded "goods," upon investigation, would prove something else than those included, his theory would be absolutely refuted.

Fortunately for Marx, however, and unfortunately for Böhm-Bawerk, Marx did *thoroughly investigate* these very "goods," "which possess exchange-value although they are not the product of labor," under which cloudy description is meant the soil and other "natural" objects which are the subjects of bargain and sale. Not only is Marx's investigation of this particular branch of the subject thorough, (it occupies about 200 pages of his book), but his theoretical explanation thereof is so convincing, that none of his critics, not even Böhm-Bawerk have ever as much as attempted to refute it. We think, therefore, that we are very charitable to Böhm-Bawerk when we assume that he really did not mean to say that Marx excluded these particular "goods" from his *investigation*, but merely from his analysis; and that he simply fell a victim to the deplorable lack of precision which seems inseparable from *all* Marx-criticism.

We must add, however, that we dwelt at such length on this point not merely because we were anxious to "show up" the carelessness of terminology and lack of precision of thought, in even the greatest of Marx-critics, important as this may be, but because the subject-matter involved in this objection is of great importance in the opinion of all Marx-critics, as well as our own. It really amounts to this:—that the labor-theory of value does not take "nature" into account or consideration, "it denies the participation of nature in the production of goods. Now, this, if true, is a very serious charge. The denial of the participation of nature in the production of "goods," or anything for that matter, is so manifestly absurd, that it will vitiate any argument, analysis, or other logical operation, into which it enters. Could Marx have been guilty of anything like that? Countless expressions of Marx show that he was not ignorant of the participation of nature in the production of "goods," if proof is necessary that Marx knew of the *existence* of nature, because that is what this charge amounts to. How, then did he deny it? How *could* he deny it? Well, of course, he couldn't. And..... he didn't!

We quote Böhm-Bawerk: "That they (commodities) are just as much the product of nature as of labor—nobody says more explicitly than Marx himself when he says:—"The bodies of commodities are combinations of two elements, natural matter and labor;" or, when he cites with approval Petty's remark that:—"Labor is the father (of material wealth), and the earth is its mother." "The guileless reader is evidently puzzled. But there is really nothing to be puzzled about. Marx is simply at his old game of contradicting himself in the most stupid manner imaginable."

If Böhm-Bawerk himself were not so careless and slovenly in his expressions, he would have noticed that when Marx speaks of the "participation" of nature he always refers to the "bodies" of commodities, or "wealth;" and when he speaks of labor as the source or measure, it is always exchange-value that he has reference to. Marx does not claim that labor is the only source of *wealth*. On the other hand, he *does* deny the "participation" of nature in the creation of exchange-value. And rightfully so. Nature, including all the material substances and forces which go into the production of "goods," has always existed, and remains unchanged. So has "wealth," (meaning in this connection an aggregation of useful articles.) Not so with exchange-value. Notwithstanding the existence of "nature" from time immemorial, and the application of labor thereto from the very beginning of the human race this combination has failed to produce exchange-value, which makes a commodity out of a mere "good," until the appearance of the capitalistic system. It is evidently something connected with the capitalistic system, and not "nature" that is responsible for this result and should be called upon to "account" for it. That is why Marx went in search of the social phenomenon which distinguishes the capitalistic system from its predecessors, as was already explained at length in a preceding article. It is interesting to recall here, however, that we have encountered the same trouble over Marx's supposed neglect of "nature" when discussing the Materialistic Conception of History. An additional proof of the monism of the Marxian System, and of the opinion oft expressed here that all Marx-criticism suffers from the same vices.

In justice, however, to the Marx-critics it must be stated right here that some of Marx's own adherents, or supposed adherents, suffer from a good many of these vices. We shall have occasion hereafter to treat this subject more at length. Here we want to refer only to a historical incident, which is right in point, and at once illustrates the prevalent carelessness in the choice of expressions and Marx's quickness to "sit on them"

wherever they are found without any bias to friend or foe. In 1875 the socialists of Germany adopted a program at their national congress held at Gotha, the opening sentence of which read: "Labor is the source of all wealth and of all culture." On learning of the contents of the draft proposed by the leaders Marx wrote a letter containing some annotations. He started out by quoting the opening sentence quoted by us above, and made it the occasion for the following remarks: "Labor is not the source of all wealth. Nature is just as much the source of use-values, (and it is of these that material wealth consists), as is labor, which is itself the manifestation of a natural force, human labor power."

There are other objections to Marx's analysis. This time not to what goes into the analysis, but as to its result. In commenting on Marx's statement that aside from the use-value of their bodies, commodities have only one common property left, that of being products of labor, Böhm-Bawerk asks: "Is that really the only common property left? Have not the exchange-value-possessing "goods" still left to them, for instance, the common property of being scarce in comparison with the want for them? Or, that they are the subject of supply and demand? Or, that they are *appropriated*? Or, that they are "natural" products? and then he adds: Why, then could not the principle of value lie just as well in any one of *these* common properties, instead of that of their being the products of labor?" The last question, that of "Nature," has just been disposed of by us. The one preceding it, that of "appropriation" is a rather curious one to be broached by an anti-Marxist of the Böhm-Bawerk type, for it suggests a lot of discussion, which may prove uncomfortable to those who have "appropriated" to themselves everything, and we may yet return to this phase of the question. For the subject of our present discussion, however, the question of "appropriation" is beside the point. To begin with, being appropriated is not a *property* but a condition or relation, and that not of the "goods" themselves, but of men with reference to them, so that being "appropriated" could evidently not be a *common property* of the "goods." We will not stand, however, with Böhm-Bawerk on small matters like that, for as we have already seen, precision of expression is not part of his equipment. But whether property, condition, or relation, or anything else, "being appropriated" is no objection to Marx's analysis. The "principle" of "value" of "goods" could not "lie" in their "being appropriated," for the same reasons that it could not be due to "nature." While "goods" were not "being appropriated" for quite as long a time as they were being produced by nature, they were so for sufficiently

long a time before the appearance either of the capitalistic system or exchange-value to settle the question.

Being "scarce" or being the *subject* of supply and demand, can hardly be said to be something which all "goods" possess in common. But as we have already stated, we wouldn't stand with Böhm-Bawerk on such things as precision of expression and other requirements of logical reasoning. There is, however, something else about these two questions to which we desire to call the attention of the reader: These *two* questions are really *one*; being scarce in comparison with a want is the same thing as being the subject of supply and demand. Why, then, put this up as two separate questions? This would be unimportant, but because of the frequency with which, as we shall have occasion to see later, Marx-critics employ this cheap manoeuvre of "criticism." It is common practice among them to repeat the same matter in different ways, in such a manner as if they were stating separate objections, in order to make a "showing" by piling up a great *quantity* of objections.

Supply and demand is, as we have seen, not a *property* of "good" but an accident of its existence. It is not something contained in it, nor is it anything in any way connected with its production. Its qualities and properties as a "good" are not in any way affected by the conditions of its supply and demand. There is no "common something" in goods which may be called their conditions of supply and demand, for no good *contains* in itself the conditions of its supply, and its demand can not only not be contained within itself but it presupposes its absence. Logically, therefore, it could certainly not be said that being the subject of supply and demand could be the "common something" which is the source and measure of value. There is another good logical reason why supply and demand could be neither the source nor the measure of value. The proposition that value depends on supply and demand seems such a very simple one, so much a matter of "common sense," that few take the trouble to inquire into its real meaning. A careful examination of the matter will show, however, that this is logically impossible. Let us see what it is: Supply and demand work in inverse directions; when the supply increases value diminishes, and when the supply diminishes value increases; and the reverse is true of demand. Now, let us suppose a condition, (the ordinary condition for most goods) where the supply and demand are normal, that is, cover each other. What should the value then be? Evidently, nil, for the two factors working upon it in opposite directions, the supply and the demand, being equal, neutralize each other, balance each other. But as we know that "goods," or at least, some

"goods," and that the most characteristic, always have some value, there evidently must be something which causes commodities to have value when supply and demand balance each other, and have, therefore, no influence.

This question of logic is best explained and tested by the facts. Value is a relative term, and is ascertained by exchange. When we speak of the value of a commodity, we compare it with something else; in our highly developed society, we compare it with the universal commodity—money. When we make a sale or exchange we compare the values of the things exchanged by exchanging them in a certain proportion. Let us, therefore, take any two commodities, say, a chair and a table. Let us say that under any given conditions of supply and demand equal for both, say normal, they exchange at the ratio of two chairs to one table. What fixes their relative value? The conditions of supply and demand being the same for both, they ought to exchange as one to one. Again, let us increase their supply equally, say, fifty per cent. Their "value" will diminish,—in comparison with other articles whose supply was not increased,—but their *relative value to each other will still remain the same*. The same thing will happen if, instead of increasing their supply we will diminish it; or, if we will increase the demand or diminish it. In other words, no matter under what conditions of supply and demand we will place them, as long as those conditions are equal, they will still retain their relative value of two to one. Evidently there must be something *in them* which makes their relative value remain the same under *all conditions* of supply and demand to which they may be alike *subjected*. What is it?

It was to find this "common something" *contained in them*, and which evidently is the source and measure of their value *irrespective* of the *conditions* of supply and demand to which they *are subject*, that Marx took up the analysis of the commodity. It was, therefore, simply puerile to point to supply and demand as the possible "common something" "wherein may lie" their value. Again, the same commodity, under the same conditions of supply and demand will have different value at different times if the methods of its production have changed. A fact which practically fills up the history of modern production.

The reader might ask: "while it seems to be true that supply and demand can not be the source or measure of value, it is still a matter of experience,—and appears in the very examples examined here,—that the condition of supply and demand *does influence* the ratio of exchange of commodities, that is their value. How do we account for it?" This consideration seems to be what led astray many economists. In fact, the matter does seem

extremely confusing. It is evident that value *must* have some source outside of supply and demand, and yet there is no denying the influence of the latter on the ratio of exchange which fixes the relative value of commodities. This confusion is only apparent, however, and not real. It is due to a failure to distinguish between the *value* of commodities and the *prices* which they bring on a particular sale in the market.

We have already explained at length in a preceding article, that value and price are different and distinct entities. This distinction must always be kept in mind, and a failure to keep this in mind will result in no end of confusion. When this distinction is borne in mind it will at once become apparent that the seeming influence of supply and demand on value is a mere optical illusion. That what it does influence is the Price, which oscillates about the value as its normal resting place to which it constantly gravitates. That is why, when supply and demand cover each other, the price is not nil: it is then at its normal resting-place,—Value, Price and Value then coincide. That is why different articles will, under the same conditions of supply and demand, exchange in an infinite number of ratios to each other, as the same conditions of supply and demand will only result for all of them in the same relation between Price and Value, but the actual price of each will depend on its own value which may, of course, be different for each. That is, in fine, why the same commodity will, under the same conditions of supply and demand, have a different price at different times, if there has been any change in the method of its production, for its value depends on its production, and will be different if different methods of production are employed, and the equal conditions of supply and demand will only bring about the same relation between Price and Value.

Many opponents of Marx make a point of the fact that Marx's theory of value does not show the formation of prices, is no guide to the actual prices paid for commodities. But a theory of value need not show that, and, as a matter of fact, could not. It would not be a theory of value if it did. This is admitted even by one of Marx's greatest opponents, Professor Carl Diehl. He says:

—“It must be settled right at the outset that for Marx, as for any other theorist on the subject of Value, there can be no identity between Value and Price. This follows necessarily from the radical difference between the two conceptions. The price of a commodity is a concrete quantitative determination: it shows us the quantity of goods or money which must be given in return for this commodity. Value, on the other hand, is an abstraction.

When we speak of the value of commodities, we mean the regulative principle which lies at the basis of the formation of prices." This is, in effect, what Marx says in the passage already quoted by us. And the facts of experience, as we have seen, amply justify his position. It is with this, as with other appeals to the facts, some of which we have already disposed of, and others are to be gone into hereafter, for Marx-critics never tire of the assertion that the *facts always* and *completely* refute Marx.

"*Experience shows,*"—says Böhm-Bawerk,—"*That the exchange-value of goods stands in any relation to the amount of labor expended in their production only in a portion of them, and in that portion only incidentally....*" We shall see that the 'exceptions' are so numerous, that they hardly leave anything for the 'rule.'" Then comes a long list of "experiences" and "exceptions," which we will consider one by one, so that none escape our attention. It must, however, always be borne in mind that Böhm-Bawerk is not alone in these statements, assertions, objections and exceptions. On the contrary, he is ably supported by a large host of comrades in arms, who do not tire of blowing the big horn about what the facts are supposed to show.

And first of all "nature" looms up large again. We have disposed of her logically, but she still remains there to vex us in practical "experience." Not that any exchange-value is claimed for nature as such. The bounties of nature are admitted to be as free as the air, provided there is as much of them, but, it is claimed, when natural objects are scarce, they have exchange-value, although no labor whatever was expended on them. "How about the native gold lump which falls down on the parcel of a landed proprietor as a meteor? or, the silver mine which he accidentally discovers on his land?" asks Böhm-Bawerk. "Will the owner be unmindful of nature's gift, and let the gold and silver lay there, or throw them away, or give it away as a gift again, only because nature gave them to him without his exerting himself?" "And why is it that a gallon of fine Rhine wine is valued at many times the value of some cheap grade of wine, although the work of producing them may be the same?" And Professor Knies asks: when a quarter of wheat is equivalent in exchange to a cord of wood, is there any difference between the wood produced by human labor in an artificial grove and that which grew wild in the primeval forest? And Professor Masaryk chimes in: "Why is virgin soil bought and sold?"

As will have been noted, all the examples upon which these objectors rely are drawn from the sphere of agriculture, except, of course, when they are taken from the air, like the golden meteor. Yet, they comprise two different categories of objects.

In the one category are to be placed those objects whose attainments without labor is purely accidental, and in the other those whose attainment without labor is the only way in which they are attainable, for the reason that they can not be produced by labor at all. The value of the articles of the first category does not *contradict* the general *laws* of value as they are laid down by Marx, nor does it even form an *exception* to the rule. The gold-lump accidentally found by a man will not be thrown away, no matter whether it was lost by somebody who spent labor for its production, or it fell down from the clouds, for the reason that it has just as much value as if he had obtained it by hard labor. Its value, like that of *all commodities*, is the socially necessary labor which must be spent in its *reproduction*. The clouds not being in the habit of showering gold on us, and the necessarily prevailing method of obtaining gold being by spending labor on its production, (strictly speaking,—on its extraction, as in the case of all products of the extracting industries), this gold if wasted, as suggested by Böhm-Bawerk, could not be obtained again from the clouds but would have to be produced by labor. The same is true of the silver found in the mine. Assuming, as Böhm-Bawerk seems to, that the mine was of such a character that it did not require any labor to extract the silver from it, the silver will still have the value represented by the labor socially necessary for its *reproduction*, owing to the fact that silver is usually obtained by working at its extraction. And it might as well be noted here, that, under the laws of Value as laid down before it is the least productive silver mine necessarily in operation in order to satisfy the wants of society, that will set the norm for the value of silver, taking, of course, into consideration any by-product which may be obtained from such mine while mining for silver. The case of the wine is akin to that of the silver. It must be remembered that "good" wine only has a greater value than "cheap" wine where it is wanted in society,—just like silver. There are places where "good" wine is not wanted; and places where silver is not much in demand. In such places "good" wine will not be considered of any more value than "cheap" wine; nor will silver be more valuable than some "base" metal. In societies where "noble" metals and "good" wines are wanted, these become the objects of special industries, respectively. And just as the labor expended on its extraction in the least productive silver mine sets the value on silver, because this mine must be used for reproduction, so will the labor expended on the production of good wine by cultivation of the least adapted soil necessarily employed therefore set the value on good wine, and for the same reason.

The same principle applies to the wood question. Where the "natural grown" wood of the primeval forests is insufficient to satisfy the wants of society and it has to be "raised," it is the labor expended on the "raised" wood that will set the value on all wood, and the wood of the primeval forest will have the same value as the wood artificially raised, for the reason that it can only be *reproduced* by means of raising; the cost of its *reproduction* is, therefore, the social labor necessary to be expended for "raised" wood.

It is entirely different, however, with the articles of the second category, chief and most typical among which is, land. Why should land upon which no labor was spent for its production, and upon which no labor need or can be spent for reproduction have value? With all that, however, this does not *refute* Marx's theory of value. We have already stated before that Marx went into the examination of this subject at length, and formulated a theory which none of his critics have even attempted to refute. Indeed, singularly enough, this branch of the Marxian theory has been passed by his critics with little or no comment. This theory, however, amounts to nothing less than this:—that *land* and all other objects which are not produced by labor *have no value*. This may sound strange in face of the fabulous prices that we know are sometimes paid for land. But these very fabulous prices are proof that the price paid does not represent the value of the land but something else entirely. Marx proves conclusively that rent is not the result of the value of the land, and the price of land is admittedly merely a "capitalization" of the rent. Marx calls attention to the fact, which is also mentioned by Böhm-Bawerk who, however, fails to draw therefrom the proper consequences, that the price of land is a multiple of the rent by a certain number of years, the number depending on the prevailing rate of interest. In other words, it is not the *value* of the land that the price nominally paid for it represents, but the price of the rent. The transaction which formally and nominally appears as a sale of land, is in reality merely the discount of the rent. It differs absolutely nothing in character from the purchase of an annuity, which is not an exchange of present values but a mere banking operation. This is well known to real estate operators.

The best proof, however, of the *theory* that land has no value, is the *fact* that any amount of land can always be had on the largest portion of our Mother Earth without the necessity of paying for it. The query of Professor Masaryk, supposed to be a refutation of Marx by "the facts,"—"why is virgin soil bought and sold?" is to be answered: "The *fact* is that *virgin soil* is not

bought and sold." It is only after the soil has been husbanded and raped and given birth to the bastard *rent* that it becomes the subject of purchase and sale, not before. And *this fact* ought to give the quietus, once and for all, to the claim that objects not produced by labor may still have value. It is true that it is pretty inconvenient for us to get to a place where land is obtainable without price because of no value, and that as far as we are concerned the argument of the places where land is free seems, therefore, *far fetched*. But, first of all, it is certainly no fault of the Marxian theory that our capitalistic class has abducted from the people all the soil, so that there is none left either in its virginity or in the possession of lawful husbandmen. And, secondly, we might ask the great host of Marx-critics to point out one place on the face of the globe, where a single article produced by labor can habitually be obtained without giving an equivalent therefor. Not on the whole face of this globe, nor even in the clouds or among the stars where Böhm-Bawerk can get gold-lumps free, can anybody find a place where chairs, coats or bicycles can be gotten free. Evidently there is a difference which the learned and astute Marx-critics failed to observe, but which is nevertheless very interesting, and ought to be for some people at least, very instructive.

There is another group of "commodities," which, although of a different character, is to be considered in this connection. This group includes all those things which, although produced by labor, are essentially the product of some higher natural gift or power, and are, therefore, irreproducible by mere labor. This includes all works of art and the like. Not being the subject of production or reproduction by labor they are, naturally, not subject to the laws of value. But some ingenious Marx-critics, the indomitable Böhm-Bawerk among them, find great cause for rejoicing in this alleged "refutation" or "exception" to the laws of value as laid down by Marx. Ever faithful to their own confused nature and very consistently confusing economics with everything alien to it under the sun, they start out from their confusion of Value and Price, and adding to it the confusion of economic price with the colloquial application of the word price to every money-payment as a consideration for something, they declare that the Marxian theory of value must be false, for here are "goods" whose "value" is evidently not determined by labor. It does one good to see how these gentlemen who usually strut about like peacocks parading their lofty "moral sense" and "idealism," and constantly berating the Marxists for their supposed gross materialism and "levelling" tendencies, come down from their high perch and place their "ideal" wares

on a level with the grossest material things. Allured by the bait of making a point against Marx, they insist that high works of art embodying noble "ideas" are just as much "goods," "wares and merchandise" to be trafficked in as anything else that comes down the pike in "due course of trade." The willingness of these gentlemen to do so does not, however, make commodities of the works of genius, any more than their hypocritical phrases change the course of human progress. While the economic conditions of capitalist society reflect on the whole range of its ideas, creating there all sorts of distorted and shapeless beings, nobody is crazy enough to seriously apply the yardstick to these matters. While an "art journal" may sometimes quote a price of a great work of art because it "fetched" that much at a sale, no "dealer" even will dare say that the Sistine Madonna is equal in value to so many steam engines, or that a certain Raphael of Rubens has risen in value since J. P. Morgan became an art Mäcenas, thus augmenting the "demand." It is true that the excesses of capitalism have tainted everything with a mercenary spirit, and has made art the subject of traffic, but this makes no more "goods" out of art-subjects than the traffic in white slaves turns love and affection into merchandise. Nor has the purchase-money paid for them any more to do with the economic categories of price and value than that paid to the harlot in compensation for her venal favors.

A different situation is presented in the case of commodities which are the result of so-called skilled or higher classes of labor. Masaryk thinks it a complete refutation of the labor theory of value that one man's labor does not produce in the same space of time as much value as that of any other man's. And Böhm-Bawerk considers it awful theoretical jugglery for Marx to say: "Skilled labor counts only as simple labor intensified, or rather, as multiplied simple labor, a given quantity of skilled labor being considered equal to a greater quantity of simple labor. Experience shows that this reduction is constantly being made. A commodity may be the product of the most skilled labor, but its value, by equating it to the product of simple unskilled labor, represents a definite quantity of the latter labor alone. The different proportions in which different sorts of labor are reduced to unskilled labor as their standard, are established by a social process that goes on behind the backs of the producers, and, consequently appears to be fixed by custom." "If," says Böhm-Bawerk, "the product of one day's labor of one man is of the same value as that of another man's five days' labor, then, no matter how people *consider* it, it forms an exception to the

alleged rule, that the exchange-value of goods depends on the amount of human labor *incorporated* in them."

These objections evidently proceed upon the theory that Marx's "alleged rule" claims that the value of commodities depends upon the amount of labor actually incorporated in them in the process of their production. It is needless to argue whether these objections would amount to anything were this the "alleged rule," for the simple reason that no such rule was ever "alleged" by Marx. We have already seen, that Marx very specifically states that *the value of a commodity does not depend on the amount of labor actually spent in its production*. And this not only with reference to skilled and unskilled labor, but even with reference to unskilled labor itself. According to the Marxian theory of value, as expounded by us above, it makes absolutely no difference whatsoever, as far as its value is concerned, how much labor, of any kind, was actually spent in its production. The reason for this is, as already explained, that value, being a social phenomenon, depends entirely on social conditions of production and distribution, and does not depend on anything relating exclusively to the individuals concerned in its production or exchange. This applies with equal force to the amount and kind of labor it cost its individual producer, as well as to the particular desires or wants of the persons immediately concerned in any of its mutations during the circulation process. This being thus, it is evidently absurd to make a point of the fact that one day's work of a skilled laborer may produce as much value as several days' work of an unskilled laborer, and consider skilled labor as an exception to the laws of value. There is no such exception, for there is no such rule except in the perverted imagination of Marx-critics, and, perhaps, some "alleged" Marxists. Were this "allegation" of the rule correct, the exceptions would be too numerous to count. We have already noted before one such important "exception," for instance, in the case of the introduction of improved methods of production before they are generally adopted, or the retention of obsolete methods of production. In either event the value of the commodities produced under the exceptional circumstances by ordinary unskilled labor will not depend on the labor actually spent in their production. Other "exceptions" will easily suggest themselves to the intelligent reader. The only trouble with all of them is that they are exceptions only to an imaginary rule, and not to the rule laid down in Marx's theory of value. It is, therefore, very sad to see how some Marxists spend their energies in making futile attempts to explain away these objections to an imaginary Marxian theory. They would spend their time with more profit to themselves and

their readers if they would leave fancy theorizing and see to it that Marx's theories are not mis-stated, the objections would then take care of themselves.

The matter in itself is very simple. *Skilled* labor, whether the skill be personal with the producer, acquired by study and training, or impersonal, due to the use of better tools, is more productive. A skilled laborer produces in a given space of time more than the unskilled one. The value of a commodity being equal to the labor which it would cost to produce it, the value of the commodity will, in accordance with the laws of value already explained by us, be the amount of *ordinary average* labor necessary for its reproduction. For it is by this labor that society will have to reproduce it, the amount of skilled labor being by its very terms limited, and can not, therefore, be had in sufficient quantities to reproduce the commodities as they are wanted. When this labor becomes so common that it can be had in any quantity for the purposes of production and reproduction of commodities, it ceases to be "skilled," and its product has no more value than that of any other average labor. The point to be remembered, however, is that while the measure of ordinary labor is the time during which it was expended, the measure of the time expended on any particular given commodity is the amount of product produced by its expenditure. In other words, the value of a commodity does not depend on the actual individual time spent in its production, but on the social time necessary for its reproduction, as was already stated at length before. When thus properly understood, the fact that the product of skilled labor is more valuable than the product of unskilled labor is no more an objection or an exception to our law of value than the fact that one man's unskilled labor produces more value than another man's unskilled labor because of a difference in the intensity of its application.

Another objection mentioned by Böhm-Bawerk, and the last to be considered by us here, is very characteristic of him and of most Marx-critics. They seem to be impregably fortified in their utter ignorance of the Marxian theories which they criticise. In their blissful ignorance they very often prate like innocent children, so that one is often at a loss as to whether they ought to be pitied or envied. Says Böhm-Bawerk, very naively:

"The well-known and universally admitted fact that even in the case of those goods whose exchange-value coincides on the whole with the labor expended in their production, this coincidence is not always preserved, forms another exception to the labor principle. Because of the oscillations of supply and demand, the exchange-value of even such commodities is often pushed above or below the level of value which corresponds to the

amount of labor incorporated in them. The latter forms only a gravitation point, not a fixed point of their exchange-value. It seems to me that the socialistic followers of the labor principle make too light of this objection. It is true that they state it, but they treat it as a small, passing irregularity whose presence does not in any way militate against the great 'law' of exchange-value."

The simplicity of soul displayed in this passage seems to be of a higher world than ours. To intrude upon it with gross earthly notions about accuracy and the like seems almost criminal. It would also be manifestly futile to attempt to explain the subtleties of Marxian thought to one who, after a careful study of the Marxian system, has failed to grasp the difference between Value and Price in that system. To speak of the individual or actual Price (for that is what Böhm-Bawerk refers to,) which, according to Marx, is *usually* different from Value, as an *exception* to Value, reveals a constitutional inability to understand the Marxian theory which ought to be admired, if not respected, for its elemental purity. And yet this is the mind which shows the way, and sets the pace, for the hosts of Marx-criticism!

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be continued.)

EDITORIAL

Probable Outlook for Russia.

It is with a full realization of the dangers accompanying prophecy and with a complete disclaimer of any special gift in that direction that we take up this discussion. There are certain general forces of social evolution at work in Russia which may be expected to produce much the same result, that they have previously produced elsewhere, and so long as prophecy is confined to examining the resultants of these forces it is wholly justifiable.

A study of the different industrial classes struggling for power and the strength back of them shows that these may be classified much as follows: First the autocracy with the grand ducal clique answering quite closely to the "First Estate" of a century ago in France. This class, essentially an anachronism even in the 19th, to say nothing of the 20th century, has behind it no industrial strength and has retained its position largely by virtue of inertia. It is now almost a negligible quantity. In the second place we have the bourgeoisie, the logical heir to the autocracy, but which seems incapable of realizing upon its inheritance. It lacks coherency, initiative and most important of all a hold upon the proletariat, sufficiently strong to compel the latter to fight its battles. Finally we have the working class composed of the city proletariat and the peasant, a class distinctly revolutionary, and which seems to have awakened to a class consciousness far keener than its industrial position would seem to justify. This proletariat has shown a remarkable adaptability in choosing its weapons for the battle. It uses with apparently equal facility the street demonstration, the mass strike, terrorism and open battle. It seems to be well nigh omnipresent. In this characteristic lies its greatest strength. This is well expressed in the following extract from a dispatch to the *Chicago Inter Ocean*:

"There are not troops enough in Europe to put down the revolution," declared a trembling army officer to-day as he boarded a train with reinforcements for the Moscow garrison. "If one town is wiped off the map another throws up defenses. The peasants are fighting in their own

back yards. They are beasts in their own caves. It would take a billion men and a century of campaigning to ferret each nest of snakes out of its hole. I fear for Russia."

It is truly impossible to put down such a revolution. It is possible that it has been crushed at Moscow, but it flames up in a hundred other places. When we come to examine the forces of suppression we find that the army itself is permeated with disaffection. The main reliance of the government is the Cossack, but as is pointed out elsewhere in this number by Comrade Kautsky the Cossack fights for loot, and it will be strange if the idea does not penetrate into his thick skull before long that much richer pickings are to be found inside of palaces than amid workingmen's hovels. When he does it will be a sorry day for those who for the last century have been training him to a career of blood and plunder.

Viewed from any point of view, however, the immediate future promises to be a dark and bloody one. Famine hangs threateningly over the great "black belt," and the same wires that bring this message to us tell us of record breaking shipments of wheat from this same locality. What the peasant will do when famine finally sweeps down upon him to add the last spur to the bestial degradation that centuries of oppression has forced upon him is something that staggers imagination.

The Manchurian army presents a problem which must not be overlooked. With between half a million and a million men several thousand miles from Russia, with only a single track railroad to bring them home, with a government practically without funds for transportation or rations, and with no desire to see them come back only to lend their aid to an impending revolution, and with that army itself disorganized by revolt it is easily possible that the world may see a sight beside which Napoleon's retreat from Moscow was but a peaceful summer walk for pleasure.

We are told repeatedly that Russia is not ready for socialism, and there is probably no disputing that proposition, but a few years or even months, of the terrible education which she is now undergoing may work wonders. When a whole nation is forced to study one topic and forced to do this amid bursting bomb, beneath the crack of Cossack whips and facing the muzzles of machine guns it is easily possible that graduation day may be somewhat hastened.

What will be the effect of all this on the world-wide proletarian movement? In the first place it is going to teach the workers something of the variety of weapons which are at their hands when needed. There has been something of a tendency in past years to over-estimate the ballot and parliamentarianism. Russia is causing a similar over-estimation of the general strike. Before she is done she will probably show us that contrary to the common impression the day of the bomb, the barricade and the bullet has not forever past. Yet up to the present time it must be admitted that she has advanced no evidence to show that in countries where universal suffrage prevails any other weapon would be as effective as the ballot. The general strike, amid a population already half crazed with revolutionary fervor, with no other method of expressing their indignation, is a totally different proposition from a general strike amid the confused political and economic ideas of modern capitalistic nations with their countless divisions among the working class.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

An election was recently held in Dresden for municipal officials. The voting is by classes—each industrial class electing a certain number of representatives. This, of course, makes it impossible for the socialists to gain a majority. The important point for American readers, however, is that the laborers were practically unanimous in voting the socialist ticket, and that the capitalist candidates received exactly the votes that they were entitled to i. e., those of capitalists. If American laborers did the same thing there would soon be none but laborers in official positions.

Whatever there may have been to criticise in the methods used in getting rid of the old *Vorwaerts* staff and installing the new editors it is very evident that a great improvement in the paper was the final result. There is a virility, strength and decisiveness to the new management that reminds one of the old days when *Der Alte Liebknecht* was at the head of the editorial staff.

AUSTRIA.

The agitation for Universal Suffrage goes on throughout Austria and has already led to a much closer union of the entire working class movement of the Austrian Empire. This agitation recently took on a rather suggestive and interesting phase. The typographical union of Vienna, disgusted at being compelled to put into type the most virulent attacks upon the campaign which they were carrying on for better conditions decided to call a strike upon those papers most abusive of the socialist party and universal suffrage. They announced that they would no longer set up such articles and that if the capitalists wished to make war upon the working class by means of the printing press they must set their own type and run their own press. As a result six of the most reactionary papers were compelled to suspend publication.

SWITZERLAND.

The Liberal Parties of Switzerland have initiated a movement for the nationalization of water power. The measure, as they proposed to submit to a referendum is hedged around with so many restrictions that the Socialists have taken little interest in it. It was the socialists nevertheless who originated this demand and who are responsible for even this

step. They have pointed out that the water power of Switzerland amounts to over one million horse power and that if it were really in the hands of a democratic government it might be made a powerful weapon for the betterment of working class conditions.

NORWAY.

The European socialist movement has been very much stirred by the action of the Social Democrats in the Norwegian Parliament in voting to welcome King Haakon to the throne of Norway.

The Berlin *Vorwaerts* was especially severe in its criticism and brought forth some replies. One of the socialist members of Parliament declared that it would have been unconstitutional to have voted otherwise after the referendum in favor of the King had received a majority of the popular vote. *Vorwaerts* very aptly replies to this by asking "Since when have socialists been bound by constitutions."

The action of one member is well worthy of notice. This is Representative Nissen who was not elected on the Social Democratic ticket, but who has continuously and consistently avowed himself a socialist, and who now shows himself to be much more entitled to the name than many of those elected on the socialist ticket. He has come out openly regretting that the social democrats did not vote against the King and take the consequences and declares that this was the only logical thing to do. Finally *Ny Tid*, the leading Socialist review is forced to admit that an excuse is necessary and it says, "We must remember that the Norwegian social democracy is relatively young as a party, at least too young to know thoroughly its function and duty. It should also not be forgotten that the Social Democratic fraction in the National Parliament was elected almost exclusively from districts in which the movement and its organization was a result of hastily conducted work and that it is almost wholly lacking in that necessary foundation—an economic movement.

"At the same time the condition of these districts are such that the older and better trained elements have little control over the movement and still less were in any condition to lead it. Therefore give us time. The Norwegian Social Democracy will certainly, if it is given time, reckon with its members in case they have deviated from the proper tactics."

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

There is no more enthusiasm among the rank and file of organized labor about the recent Pittsburg convention of the American Federation of Labor than there is at a funeral. Practically nothing commendatory appears in the labor press, while reports of delegates to central bodies bristle with criticisms regarding the many inconsistencies that were displayed and the unfair methods practiced by those in control. At the painters' convention held in Memphis last month, some of the delegates expressed such general dissatisfaction that an effort was made to withdraw from the Federation by withholding payment of per capita tax. The jurisdictional controversies was the cause of an acrimonious discussion among the delegates. The brewers' national officials have hurled defiance at their persecutors. Their slogan is, "We stand on our bond!" and the delegates to city central bodies are instructed to fight against having the union disorganized to the last ditch. In New Orleans the brewers were unseated, and latest reports state that other unions have taken up their fight and general disruption is threatened. At the meeting of the Kentucky State Federation an attempt was made to bar the brewers, but they were finally admitted despite the machinations of the gang in control. Later on, when the ringsters attempted to transact business in a high-handed manner, protected by the police, about half of the delegates bolted, and now feeling is running high in many of the local unions and central bodies in the state. The plumbers all over the country are marshaling their forces to make a fight against being disrupted. They are an industrial organization, including the various crafts that work in the pipe line. The Pittsburg convention voted in favor of instructing the executive council to grant a dual union of steamfitters a charter, although the latter had been directed by a previous convention to join the plumbers. This means more trouble for central bodies. The longshoremen and seamen show no disposition to adjust their grievances, and the latter, at their convention in Cleveland, last month, offered no compromise. The seamen are backing up a bolting faction of longshoremen on the Pacific Coast, but whether that secession movement will spread eastward only time will tell. A report from Wheeling says that some of the stogie-makers, who were denied a charter by the A. F. of L. (although their representatives claimed as much right to recognition as the steamfitters), but were referred to the cigarmakers' union, are planning to start an agitation to join the Industrial Workers of the World. At present they are an independent organization, strongly organized in some districts, and they also have the support and sympathy of many local unions of other trades.

The elements that are dissatisfied with the A. F. of L. are naturally

looking askance at the I. W. W., which body appears to be gaining strength in New York, Chicago and smaller places, especially in the West. A national officer of the brewers told me a few weeks ago that the rank and file in many parts of the country are clamoring to cut loose from the Federation and join the Industrialists. The members claim that they are tired of being used as a football in Federation conventions, after all the sacrifices they have made for some of the organizations that turn against them whenever a test is made. Still another national officer—a Socialist, by the way—said that he had visited the little city of Schenectady, N. Y. recently, and found the machinists, metal polishers and several other trades unions in open revolt against their national organizations and going into the camp of the Industrial Workers. Some of the garment working crafts and textile workers are also affected. It begins to look as though we are to have another war similar to the struggle between the old K. of L. and the A. F. of L. But I am told by a prominent member of the I. W. W. that not all is lovely in that organization, that the original industrialists and the departmentalists are lining up to give battle, and that in some places where the DeLeonites and Anarchists had combined and held control the Socialists obtained possession of the machinery. This is said to be the present situation in Chicago and to an extent in New York. "If a convention were held next month," an Industrialist writes, "the element in control in Chicago last July wouldn't be one, two, three, and I predict that at the next convention the academic vagaries forced upon us by the DeLeon-Anarchist combine will be dropped for a plain fighting program that everybody can understand and conjure with." Rumors are in the air that the Western miners and President Sherman and his friends are souring on DeLeon and Secretary Trautmann and their followers. It is further stated that Sherman and the miners are about to establish an official organ in Chicago, in opposition to DeLeon's People, the white elephant which the obstreperous Dan tried to saddle upon the new movement as a semi-official organ via the stenographic report of Debs', DeLeon's and Hagerty's speeches. A. S. Edwards is slated as editor of the Chicago paper. Now just imagine Edwards and DeLeon editing in peace and harmony! Back five years or so ago Edwards, as one of the original Social Democratic party promoters, was one of the prominent "manifestoers," in which war of words the poor, homeless kangaroos were held up to scorn as deleonites in disguise who had no other object in life but steal the S. D. P. While Victor Berger swore blue streaks of "sepermenters" through the Wahrheit, and Margaret Haile wept sad tears and Miss Thomas said, "Ain't they horrid!" Edwards kept beating the drum on the then official organ so loudly that another convention had to be called for the purpose of searching the kangas to learn whether they had any deleonism concealed about their persons, which, I am happy to chronicle, resulted in everybody shaking hands with everybody else at least seventeen times and pledging eternal friendship and support. And now Edwards and Dan are going to edit in the same movement, armed to the teeth with trusty pen, scissors and paste-pot. The experiment will be worth watching with interest. Meanwhile, and on the other side, the unregenerated Berger will continue to fling the harpoon at Mailly, Carey, "the politician," and others who deserted the "lost cause" and joined the kang enemy and have never been forgiven. Politics makes strange bed-fellows: that's a cinch.

The eight-hour strike of the printers has been dragging along wearily for four months, with the men making steady headway and on the first of the month the struggle broke forth in all its fury from one end of the country to the other in a general walkout of about 50 per cent of the members, the remainder having succeeded in gaining their demand through negotiations or short strikes. The foolishness of craft antonomy is once

more exemplified in this sanguinary engagement. Here, on the employers' side, organized capitalism has been supporting the United Typothetae of America (the employing printers' organization), both morally and financially for months. Parry's National Association of Manufacturers, the Citizens' Alliance and similar bodies of capitalists have deliberately donated money, restricted production by holding up their printing, and brought every pressure possible to bear upon unorganized capitalists, including printing office proprietors to force them to oppose the International Typographical Union. There, on the side of the workers, the compositors stand practically alone. The other crafts of the trade have been mere on-lookers, aside from a few exceptional cases. The pressmen and feeders have been tied down by an alleged agreement that provides for the open shop, and which has another year to run. The bookbinders and rulers have a bankrupt treasury and no support to extend to those among them who evinced a desire to take a hand in the fight. In most places these union people worked upon scab jobs produced by strike-breakers, and quite naturally received the highest and most enthusiastic laudation from their bosses who were busy attempting to smash their sister organization. Yet the pressmen, feeders, binders and rulers know full well that if the eight-hour day is enforced in the composing room it will naturally be introduced in other departments. What the outcome will be is difficult to predict. Despite the almost insurmountable obstacles that confront them from the side of class-conscious, fighting capitalism, and the load on their backs in the shape of the neutral or inactive crafts in their trade, the compositors seem to have the best of the situation, largely because they are skilled and intelligent men, and their union is one of the best disciplined and ablest conducted in the country. On the first of the year they entered into the general fight with over three hundred (or nearly one-half) the unions in the international jurisdiction signed up for the eight hour day, while about 25,000 newspaper printers have been working under that system for a number of years.

The next great struggle that is looming up on the industrial horizon is that of the miners. As has been mentioned in previous numbers of the REVIEW, both sides have been preparing for a contest for months. On the side of the union ceaseless efforts have been made by the officers and organizers to combine the workers in every district. President Mitchell took personal charge of the campaign, and a large degree of success has crowned the efforts of the organizers in bringing the careless and indifferent ones back into the fold. The financial resources of the union are also being attended to. On the part of the operators, if reports from various parts of the country can be given credence, great stocks of coal have been piled up to supply the consumers for several months in case of a general suspension, and at famine prices, of course. At the Shamokin convention of anthracite miners last month three distinct demands were made, viz.: recognition of the union, eight-hour day, and higher wages for the lowest paid workers in and about the mines. A committee was instructed to negotiate with the coal barons and report at a convention to be held later. The operators have announced that they will concede present conditions, and nothing more, which means that, if the men stick by their demands, a struggle will be precipitated. In the bituminous field the operators have been clamoring for a further reduction in wages—some as high as 25 per cent. The miners reply that they will accept no more reductions under any circumstances, and they demand that the $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent cut made two years ago be restored. That is, briefly, the issue in both districts. There is a possibility that the differences between the opposing forces may be compromised. If not, upward of half a million men will engage in the greatest strike that has ever occurred on this continent, and the effects would be so far-reaching that no man could predict the final outcome.

BOOK REVIEWS

SCIENCE AND REVOLUTION. *By Ernest Untermann. Library of Science for the Workers, vol. IV. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 56 Fifth Avenue. Cloth, 194 pages, 50 cents.*

Everywhere one observes the tendency of people to overestimate the value of their own possessions. Not only is this so in the matter of furniture and chickens, it is conspicuous in a man's rating of the particular kind of knowledge he himself happens to have cultivated. So far from Socialists being exempt from this habit, it crops up everywhere in our ranks. Those who are afflicted most pronouncedly are usually not satisfied with exalting their own particular kind of knowledge,—of which they have usually none too much,—but seek to still further enhance its importance, and their own, by openly sneering at every other kind. Few things are so admirable in a socialist as a close and exact knowledge of Marxian economics. No socialist is justified in considering his mental equipment even relatively complete until he has mastered the theory of surplus value and is conversant with other matters that pertain to the socialist position in political economy. But one cannot help observing in many quarters a deplorable tendency to decry and belittle every phase of socialist thought which does not deal directly with value, price or profit. The attitude of these critics, as a rule, is due to the fact that outside economics, their minds are almost entirely blank. It seems to be an integral part of their philosophy—and it is likely they have one of a kind, great as is their antipathy to the word—that what they do not know is not worth knowing. There are several socialist speakers of this type and at least one editor. Where speakers and editors behave in this way, it is but natural that a considerable body of the “rank and file” should be infected. It is from this source we get the parrot cry that socialism is an economic question and has nothing to do with biology, religion or philosophy. To those who wish to see this narrowing tendency discouraged, who wish to see in the socialist thought of this country a full and explicit recognition of the materialist conception of history, with its far-reaching relations to science, history and philosophy, both ancient and modern; to such nothing has happened recently, so entirely welcome or of so great importance, as the appearance of Untermann's *Science and Revolution*.” Those who wish to see American socialist thinking develop to the same scope and calibre as that of continental Europe will do everything in their power to give this work the widest possible circulation.

The socialist movement of this country is slow to produce great writers. In books, we have produced nothing as yet that posterity will

care to read except perhaps Morgan's "Foundations" and Hilquit's "History." Apart from these two "Science and Revolution" is the first genuine socialist classic to make its appearance in this country without being translated or imported. It would be a source of much self-congratulation if this book were only a thorough native, but we cannot forget the author's German education. The book itself renders such an oversight impossible, for notwithstanding the popular style, consciously adopted, there stands revealed on every page a scholarship and a fearlessness of the theological world, that one seeks for with small success among native writers. Those who believe it is "good policy" to suppress in our literature and on our platform the real nature of historical materialism, lest we should scare those misty minded newcomers who enter our party expecting to find a more sympathetic reception for their obsolete ideas, will get little encouragement from our author.

In a party where every third person is a spiritualist or swedenborgian or theosophist or seventh day adventist or divine healer or astrologer or a believer in the great gospel or "message" that "Man is God" or "I am it" or "I am that I am," the appearance of "Science and Revolution" is a boon to make one wish that a few of the defunct gods were still alive that we might give them thanks. It would, no doubt, be wholly impracticable to make a careful study of such a work as this a condition of party membership, but it is to be hoped the time is not far distant when some such test will be applied to party orators, soap box and others, before they undertake the enlightenment of an ignorant public.

As to reviewing the contents of the book, no attempt is made here. Those who have been accustomed to look to such writers as Clodd and Draper for an explanation of the dark ages, will readily appreciate the immense superiority of Untermann's interpretation of the social phenomena of that period. While he also recognizes the important part played by church mystics and Christian theologians as leaders of reaction he penetrates below the surface, laying bare the economic causes of that reaction, a task altogether beyond their mental powers and utterly uncongenial to thinkers of their class affiliation.

Another most valuable feature is the development of the idea of a proletarian science. This idea is carefully and brilliantly worked out to its logical conclusion "Materialist Monism," the latest born child of modern positive science. This conclusion will probably meet with considerable opposition, the most vigorous of which may be expected from quarters where the principal qualification for the discussion is profound ignorance of the question.

In conclusion lest any one should mistakenly suppose that Comrade Untermann wishes to make "Materialist Monism" a party qualification, let the reader carefully ponder the following passage from the chapter entitled "a waif and its adoption," one of the most valuable chapters to be found in the entire range of socialist literature—"Of course it is not necessary that every member of the socialist parties should endorse the full conclusions of the socialist philosophy. For these conclusions reach far beyond the present and future requirements of party activity. But this cannot prevent us from making use of our right of free speech within and without the party for the mutual education of ourselves and others by means of free discussion of vitally human problems. On the contrary it is one of our greatest duties to make use of this right and guard it against reactionary attempts to stifle the free word in the interest of some "sacred hallucination."

ARTHUR MORROW LEWIS.

SOCIALISM AND SOCIETY, by J. Ramsay MacDonald.

This work, which is the second in the Socialist Library of the Independent Labor Party of England has well been designated as socialism for the little bourgeoisie. This is true from every point of view. For the author the greatest task of democracy is "can it work out a scheme." He is idealistic, declaring that "individuals formulate ideas, society gradually assimilates them and gradually the assimilation shows its effect on the social structure." His definitions are somewhat remarkable, for instance, "socialism is nothing more than a criticism of society from the point of view of mutual aid and the formation of a policy in accordance with the laws of mutual aid."

He starts out to teach socialism from the point of view of biological thought, but the biology upon which he bases his reasoning is that of Huxley's and Spencer's interpretation of Darwin, which while valuable enough in its day is now as completely outgrown in its details as the old creation theory was when they began to write. He still reflects in every way the re-action from the creation theory which sought to turn out the baby with the bath by denying the existence of catastrophies and exaggerating the uniformity of nature. De Vries, Burbank, Morgan, Loeb, and a host of others have shown that there are sudden transitions in biology as well as slow transformations.

When we come to his examination of the socialist doctrines and his attack on the class struggle we are struck with the superficiality of his entire reasoning. For instance, he attempts to do away with the doctrine of class consciousness by telling us that the enlightened bourgeoisie would also work for socialism. We presume that this statement has been made by the enemies of socialism and its weakness explained by the socialists at least a hundred times a year for the last twenty-five years, and it seems as if it was almost time that those who claimed to be socialists realized that it is not to the interest of any class, *as a class*, to commit suicide, whether enlightened or otherwise, whatever it may be to the interest of the individuals of that class to do, in so far as they are class conscious they will follow *class* and not *individual* interests. When he attempts to show that there are other oppositions in society with the implication that they are of equal importance with those between the seller of labor power and the owner of capital he becomes almost childish. He exaggerates the competition between capitalist and the higgling of the market between buyers and sellers to the dignity of equality with the great class struggle.

Again he finds "no principle of social re-construction" in class feeling. Apparently he is in utter ignorance of the sense of a solidarity and an *esprit de corps* which its position as a class and its necessity of struggling has created within the proletariat and the ideal which has arisen out of it. After this we are not surprised to hear him say that the old pure and simple trades unionism is "the purest expression" of the class struggle.

Falling back once more upon his idealism, he declares that it is necessary to "place an intellectual motive above the economic," but he neglects to tell us what is the source of this intellectual motive. Indeed his entire discussion of ethical and intellectual motive forces is very characteristic of the bourgeois writings on these subjects, in that, while it tacitly implies the discarded intuitive philosophy it nowhere states it. His definition of class consciousness is worth adding to this choice collection of definitions.

He says "the workmen who vote liberal and unionist to-day are perfectly conscious of the drawbacks of a life of wage earnings; they are also quite conscious that they belong to a separate economic and

social class—and a great many of them would like to belong to another. In short, in any natural meaning of the words they are class conscious."

Without attempting to discuss what he means by "natural" it is enough to say that socialism has furnished enough explanations of what class consciousness means to those who introduced the words to the language and who have founded a movement upon it to make such a definition inexcusable. Socialists have always pointed out that class consciousness included a recognition of the social functions of the working class and their place in social evolution.

After all this we cannot but wonder why he advocates an independent political party. His philosophy is the philosophy of Fabianism and his last chapter jars with the rest of the work.

His attempt to drag biology in by the heels with superficial comparisons and analogies, such as are to be found for instance on pages 149 and 154, are not sufficient in any way to entitle the work to be considered as an application of biology of socialist thought and doctrines.

Such a work at this time is all the more to be regretted because one of the pressing needs of socialist propaganda is a work which will show the relation of the latest thought in science to social life and this book cannot but put the readers on the wrong track.

THE LONG DAY: the Story of a New York Working Girl as Told by Herself. The Century Co., Cloth, 303 pages \$1.20 net.

Of all the stories of "experiences" in working class life we have no hesitation in according this the foremost place. It rings true throughout. Its strength is the strength of fact. Its title is aptly chosen. For the "day" of the working girl in the industries here described is indeed "long"—limited, in fact, only by human endurance. The writer finds herself in New York searching for work with but a few dollars in her pocket. As her little savings disappear she gradually slides down the line of boarding houses into less and less comfortable conditions. She finds that "work was plenty enough, it nearly always is, the question was, not how to get a job but how to live by such jobs as could be got." She ran the gamut of the occupations open to an unskilled girl in a great city. Box-making, laundry working, paper flowers, sewing, were some of these. In most of these there was simply a variation in the torture, the foulness of the surroundings, the grinding pressure of poverty. The story is a terrible, vivid flash light of the Hades of modern capitalism. It would have been better had the author contented herself with description and narration, because when she attempts to add a few pages concerning remedies, the result is flat failure. But as a vivid contribution to the literature of life the book has few equals.

INDUSTRIAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, by Katharine Coman. The Macmillan Co., Cloth, 343 XXIV. \$1.25 net.

It is a most remarkable fact that in the country of modern industries par excellence there are no Industrial Histories. This work is the first one to be in any way worthy of the name. It must be considered therefore as a pioneer work and must not be required to come up to the standard which would be expected in a more thoroughly tilled field. The chapters dealing with the colonial period are perhaps the best in the book. There is an excellent treatment of the operation of the early "Chartered Companies" and of "The business aspects of colonization." The attempt to graft European conditions of land tenure on to a virgin continent produced some curious results. Ultimately, of course, the new conditions

worked out a new land system of their own. The chapter on the industrial aspects of the revolution supplies in compact form a much needed treatment of this subject. There is, however, a lack of recognition of the part played by western land speculation and the treatment of the tea tax is the conventional one whose fallacy should have been recognized by the author. The tea was not refused because "The colonists were determined to vindicate their right of self-taxation" in spite of the low price of tea, but because of the fact which the author states a few lines above this quotation, that the English made it possible for "The East India Co. tea to pay the colonial duty and yet retail at a lower price than that charged for the smuggled article."

The industrial consequences of the revolution were extremely significant and these are treated in a quite adequate manner. "The Industrial Consequences of the War of 1812" and "The Epoch of Expansion," summarizes the period prior to the struggle between the north and south.

On the whole the work fills a much needed place and is far superior to any ordinary school history in giving a few of the vital facts in American history. Could it be introduced into the schools in place of the ordinary text book it would mean a great advance in the study of American History. At the same time, however, there are many things lacking which belong in any adequate treatment.

The period of the industrial revolution is not discriminated with sufficient clearness or treated as adequately as its importance deserves.

The discussion of the causes of the Civil War makes little account of the struggle between the North and South for the control of the north west. This was really one of the typical points of the whole struggle. The building of the Erie Canal and the railroads from the Atlantic coast finally determined the balance of industrial control in that locality and therewith settled the fate of the South.

When we come to examine the bibliography we are surprised at some of the things that are omitted. There is no sign that the author has ever heard of the previous "Industrial History of the United States" by Alfred S. Bolles and there is no reference to "De Bow's Review," the great authority on southern conditions prior to the Civil War. There is no mention of David A. Well's "Recent Economic Changes." Although there is a discussion of Washington's work in the West, there is no reference to the Monograph on that subject by Herbert B. Adams, nor is the work by Eleanor L. Lord on "Industrial Experiences in the British Colonies" mentioned, although this subject is treated, and reference made to other much less important works. There is little use made of the valuable monographs in the censuses and few references to them in the bibliography. Although the frontier is given a rather inadequate treatment no reference is made to Turner's monograph on that subject.

MacGregor's "The Progress of America," although the main source of information prior to 1840 has apparently not been consulted, and neither Helper's "Impending Crisis" nor the reply to that work by Kettel entitled "Southern Wealth and Northern Profits" are mentioned, although they are two of the principal authorities on the economic conditions relating to slavery. These are but a very few of the deficiencies in re-search which might be noted. Nevertheless it is a somewhat ungracious task to criticise when so much has really been accomplished. Any socialist who reads the work carefully will have laid the foundation for an understanding of the forces that are making for socialism in America.

SOCIALIST SONGS, DIALOGUES AND RECITATIONS, *Compiled by Josephine R. Cole. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Paper, 55 pages, 25 cents.*

This is rather an indication of things to come than a sign of some-

thing accomplished. That there is a demand for such a work shows that class consciousness has reached the stage of having its own social life. As to the selections themselves they vary much in character. Some are decidedly commonplace, others are full of strength. It will probably help to give life to the work of many a socialist local.

The mass of pamphlets has already grown too large to admit even a notice of all of them. A few of the more important received during the last month are mentioned below.

The Public Publishing Company, of Chicago, has just issued Leo Tolstoy's *A Great Iniquity* in the form of a neat and convenient little pamphlet containing a hitherto unpublished picture of the author, bare-footed, in peasant costume. This is the article which originally appeared in the London *Times* and which is to a large extent a re-presentation of the theory of Henry George. As such the arguments are probably familiar to most of our readers. Tolstoy would add to the single tax the idea of religion with his peculiar interpretation of that word. The few instances in which he refers to socialism in the article only serve to expose his complete ignorance of the movement which is now overturning his own country. As an important historical document the pamphlet deserves a place. As an effective force in modern social evolution it is insignificant and this notwithstanding the genius of its writer.

Prof. John R. Commons, of the University of Wisconsin, has written a series of monographs, which have appeared in different economic journals on labor questions, which are of very great value. Among these are discussions of the Long Shoremen's Union, the teamsters' and stock yards' strikes of Chicago. These monographs are essential to any thorough study of the trades unions movement in the United States at the present time.

The National Child Labor Committee, 125 East Twenty-second St. New York City, has recently issued leaflets by Jane Addams, Felix Adler and Myron E. Adams, treating different sides of the child labor question. These leaflets contain valuable material, although presented from the reformers' standpoint with little grasp of the revolutionary forces which really accomplish the avowed aims of the committee.

Comrade E. J. Foote has assembled "*Essays on Socialism*," which appeared previously in socialist periodicals and which form a very good presentation of the conventional socialist arguments.

W. A. Orme, evidently a small capitalist of Atlanta, Ga., issues a pamphlet "*Trusts*," which is a typical wail of woe from the small business man, and is indicative of the attitude of that class to whom, to quote the pamphlet aforesaid, "William Randolph Hearst has appeared like a meteor from Heaven to give light as well as to shield and protect suffering humanity." Further comment is unnecessary.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

RECORD-BREAKING ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW SOCIALIST BOOKS.

Never in the history of our co-operative publishing house have so many new books of the highest value to socialists been published in any entire year as are now announced for immediate issue. Starting in 1899 with the scantiest resources, we have gradually built up the largest socialist book publishing house in the English-speaking world, because we have, nearly twelve hundred of us, put our slender assets together and used them to bring out the books we want to read and to circulate. Of the books here announced, those by Osborne Ward and "The Changing Order" by Dr. Triggs are now ready, while the others will be issued at intervals of a week or two, the entire number being ready within a few weeks.

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

This is a new series of books for socialists, entirely distinct from the Social Science library which we import from England. These books will be handsomely bound in uniform style and will be printed on antique finish paper of extra quality and good weight. The size of page will be 7¾ by 5 inches, and the average number of pages about three hundred. These books will compare favorably in every way with books sold by capitalist publishing houses at \$1.50 a volume, but our retail price will be a dollar a volume, and our price to those subscribing for stock will be sixty cents postpaid or fifty cents if sent at purchaser's expense.

1. *The Changing Order*. A Study of Democracy. By Oscar Lowell Triggs, Ph. D.

The author of this book was until lately a professor in the University of Chicago, but he injudiciously taught more truth than was consistent with the material interests of Standard Oil, and he is no longer a professor in the University of Chicago. "The Changing Order" is a study of the inevitable rise of an industrial democracy, which must soon dethrone the trust magnate and rule in his stead. This rising democracy is in a sense economic, for its base is economic. But it is also true that the spirit of this democracy will bring radical changes in art, literature, education, work, play, philosophy and religion. These impending changes are the

subject of Dr. Triggs' work, and he has brought to it a ripe scholarship and an artistic literary style that make the book at once indispensable and charming.

2. *Better-World Philosophy*. By J. Howard Moore, professor of Biology in the Crane Training High School, Chicago.

This work is a study of human relations, starting neither from theology nor from sentimentalism, but from the scientific basis of evolution. Starting here, and keeping always on verifiable ground, the author develops logically an explanation of altruism and the ethical impulses which is helpful and satisfying. Especially interesting to socialists is the author's chapter entitled "Egoism and Altruism, in which he shows that the altruistic sentiment is a direct outgrowth of the class struggle. The first edition of this book appeared in 1899, and it received enthusiastic endorsements from Henry D. Lloyd, Robert G. Ingersoll, George D. Herron, Lester F. Ward, and John P. Altgeld.

3. *The Universal Kinship*. By J. Howard Moore, Author of "Better-World Philosophy."

This new work is being brought out simultaneously by our co-operative publishing house in Chicago and the London house of George Bell and Sons. The scope of the book is best explained by a few sentences from the author's preface: "The Universal Kinship means the kinship of all the inhabitants of the planet Earth. Whether they came into existence among the waters or among desert sands, in a hole in the earth, in the hollow of a tree, or in a palace; whether they build nests or empires; whether they swim, fly, crawl or ambulate; and whether they realize it or not, they are all related, physically, mentally, morally—this is the thesis of this book."

4. *Principles of Scientific Socialism*. By Rev. Charles H. Vail.

This is one of the most satisfactory statements in popular language of the principles commonly accepted by the international socialists of all countries. It has had a large sale in pamphlet form. Our publishing house has lately purchased the plates and copyright from the author, and will soon issue this standard work in the attractive form of the International Library of Social Science.

5. *Some of the Philosophical Essays On Socialism And Science, Religion, Ethics, Critique of Reason and the World at Large*. By Joseph Dietzgen. Translated by M. Beer and Th. Rothstein. With a biographical sketch and some introductory remarks by Eugene Dietzgen. Translated by Ernest Untermann. Edited by Eugene Dietzgen.

Joseph Dietzgen stood next to Marx and Engels in the first shaping and development of the principles of scientific socialism. His name is as yet comparatively new to American readers, since until now his writings have not been published in the English language, but Ernest Untermann's recent work, "Science and Revolution," gives some idea of Dietzgen's service in the development of consistent proletarian philosophy, and this first opportunity to obtain his works in English will, no doubt, be eagerly welcomed. The present volume of contributions by Dietzgen to the Volkstaat on Scientific Socialism, the Religion of Social Democracy, Ethics of Social Democracy, Social Democratic Philosophy, etc. It will be followed

in a few months by another volume containing with other matter "The Positive Outcome of Philosophy" and "The Nature of Human Brain-work."

THE STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES.

Eleven of these volumes have already been published, including some of the most important works of European and American socialists. The books are of a convenient size either for the pocket or for the library shelf; they are tastefully and substantially bound, and retail for fifty cents each, the price to stockholders being thirty cents postpaid or twenty-five cents if sent at purchaser's expense. These new volumes are now nearly ready for the press:

12. *The Positive School Of Criminology.* Three Lectures given at the University of Naples, Italy, by Enrico Ferri. Translated by Ernest Untermann.

There is no other living socialist writer who combines scientific thought and interesting style to so high a degree as Enrico Ferri, of Italy. Recognized by the defenders of capitalism as the ablest living criminologist, he has forced the socialist explanation of crime upon the universities of capitalism. The present volume gives a historical sketch of the development of the science of criminology, and an excellent statement of the positive conclusions thus far reached by the advanced school of which Ferri is the ablest living representative.

13. *The World's Revolutions.* An Historical Study. By Ernest Untermann.

Seldom does a work combine propaganda and educational matter so effectively as this. Starting with the geological and biological basis of life, the author traces the great revolutions of history in a strikingly interesting manner. Here are some of the chapter titles: The Individual and the Universe, Primitive Human Revolutions, The Roman Empire and the Proletariat, The Christian Proletariat and Its Mission, Feudal Ecclesiasticism and Its Disintegration, The American Revolution and Its Reflex in France, Bourgeois Revolutions in Europe, The Proletarian Movement.

14. *Social And Philosophical Studies.* By Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr.

This brilliant and versatile writer, one of the most prominent socialists of Europe, is already well known to American readers through his story "The Sale of an Appetite" and his articles published from time to time in the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. He lately published in Paris a remarkably original and suggestive study of the causes of the persistence of theological beliefs among the propertied classes and the almost complete disappearance of these beliefs among wage-workers. The forthcoming volume will contain this study, now offered for the first time in English, together with the author's inquiries into the Idea of Justice and the Idea of Good," also new to English readers, beside some articles reprinted from the REVIEW.

THE LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS.

This new series, in which The Evolution of Man, Germs of Mind in Plants, The End of the World and Science and Revolution have thus far been published, is uniform in size and price with the Standard Socialist

Series but bound in cloth of a different color. The books in this series, with the exception of *Science and Revolution*, do not deal directly with social questions nor the socialist movement. They do, however, convey information which is essential to any full understanding of the principles of socialism, and they convey that information in a style that is attractive and readily understood. This series has met with an instant success. The *Evolution of Man* is already in its sixth thousand, and the other books are selling rapidly. In addition to the four volumes published and the three volumes announced, there are no less than ten more volumes available for translation, which we can issue as soon as the necessary capital is subscribed. The following books will be ready early in 1906:

5. *The Triumph Of Life*. By William Boelsche, translated by May Wood Simons.

A companion volume to "The Evolution of Man," and even more interesting in its subject matter. It traces the origin of life on this earth, then shows how it has penetrated to the depths of the ocean, climbed to the mountain heights, entered into the most minute spaces and filled every corner of the earth with its manifestations, until it has finally triumphed over all obstacles. Moreover it shows how all these diverse conditions have modified life into its present manifold forms. "The Triumph of Life" is thus one of the most complete and one of the most entrancing studies of life in its multiple relations that has ever been written.

6. *Life And Death*. By Dr. E. Teichman, translated by A. M. Simons.

How did life first arise? What are its distinguishing characteristics? How is it maintained? How does it increase? What is death? This book gives the latest answers of science to these old yet ever-new questions. It is popular in style, scientifically accurate, and intensely interesting.

7. *The Making Of The World*. By Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Ernest Untermann.

This volume is a sequel to "The End of the World," the popular volume by the same author which we published in November. This later work shows how the birth of a new world follows the wreck of one that has been destroyed, and traces the processes through which the world on which we live has passed to reach its present state.

BOOKS BY C. OSBORNE WARD.

One of the most gifted and tireless scholars America ever produced was the late C. Osborne Ward, for many years translator and librarian of the United States Department of Labor. His chosen field was the history of the labor movement in the earliest times of which written records have been preserved. In the search for his material he ransacked the greatest libraries of the world, and then traveled on foot through the countries bordering on the Mediterranean Sea, deciphering inscriptions and investigating every vestige of evidence bearing on working-class life in early days.

Mr. Ward's books were originally issued from the office of the National Watchman, a paper no longer published, and have never been generally advertised nor to any extent brought to the attention of the socialists, who are just the ones who know how to make use of the wealth of information the author collected. Our co-operative publishing house has now purchased from his heirs all the remaining copies of his books, and has obtained the exclusive right to print new editions from the plates.

A considerable sum of money will soon be required to make the payments called for by this contract, and we urge every socialist who reads this announcement to send for one or more of the books. We have a supply of all the titles on hand, and each order will be filled promptly.

The Ancient Lowly. A History of the Ancient Working People from the Earliest Known Period of the Adoption of Christianity by Constantine. Volume I, illustrated, 573 pages, \$2.00.

This volume treats of the traits and peculiarities of races; the Indo-Europeans and their competitive system; the true history of labor found only in inscriptions and mutilated annals; the Eleusian Mysteries; ancient grievances of the workers; strikes and uprisings among the laborers of classic Greece, labor troubles among the Romans; strike of Drimakos the Chian slave; rebellion under Viriathus in Spain; rebellion under Eunus in Sicily; a bloody strike in Asia Minor under Aristonicus; second Sicilian labor war under Athenion; Spartacus the gladiator and the slave revolt at Rome; Rome's organized workingmen and workingwomen; ancient federations of labor; organized armor-makers who supplied the Roman armies; how Rome was fed; unions of play-actors and circus performers; textile and clothing trades; pagan and Christian image-makers; true golden age of organized labor; unions of Romans and Greeks compared; the Red Flag, the incalculably aged banner of labor; pre-Christian communes in Palestine; ancient plans of "blessed" government.

The Ancient Lowly. Vol. II. Latest light from original sources on the ancient labor movement. Cloth, illustrated, 716 pages, \$2.00.

Contents: Nationalization of slaves and its disastrous effect on unions at Rome; strike of the Jews under Moses against Egypt; later strikes in Egypt; Nabis, a labor leader who became tyrant of Sparta; international secret trade unions of antiquity; India's brotherhoods; class war at Rome in first century B. C.; pre-Christian unions; unions under the Roman emperors; international union of actors and musicians; the organization of the old International; light on ancient music from newly-discovered inscriptions; communism of ancient trade-unionists; their political action; girl martyrs of the working class at Athens; persecution of Christians aimed against the labor unions; new light on the early history of Christianity; massacres of Diocletian; how Constantine took control of Christianity. Each volume of *The Ancient Lowly* is complete in itself, and they are sold either together or separately.

The Equilibration Of Human Aptitudes And Powers Of Adaptation. Cloth, 333 pages, \$1.50.

Contents: Mechanism of Society, dwarfing effect on the individual of competition; Piracy of Aptitudes; Plagiarism of Genius; Concord of Faculties; Fundamental Errors, objection to socialism refuted; General Averages, how the rewards of individuals will adjust themselves under collectivism; Comparative Claims, paternalism in behalf of privileged classes contrasted with co-operation by and for the workers.

A Labor Catechism Of Political Economy. A Study for the People. Cloth, 304 pages, \$1.00.

This book is written in the form of question and answer, and discusses in ample detail a great number of the problems incident to the transition from capitalism to the co-operative commonwealth. The first edition appeared in 1877, long before the existence of an American socialist movement, and it reflects to some extent the economic conditions of the time

and place of its production, but the author was a careful student of the writings of European socialists, and most of what he has written makes excellent propaganda to-day.

THE COMPANY'S FINANCES.

Two years ago, we were carrying a crushing load of debt. The stockholders most interested in the work of the company have contributed toward paying off this debt various sums, which have been acknowledged in this department of the REVIEW from month to month. The record to the end of 1905 is as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$4,508.28
J. B. Sigler, Texas50
Thomas Potts, Pennsylvania	1.00
H. M. Wilson, Pennsylvania	2.80
A. F. Simmonds, New York	2.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	6.30
Total	\$4,520.88

These contributions, in connection with new subscriptions to stock, have paid off the debt to outsiders, so that the publishing house starts the new year with no debt except to its own stockholders, with the exception of the current monthly bills, which will easily be paid out of the month's receipts.

One-half of the total contributions were made by Charles H. Kerr in accordance with his published offer to duplicate the contributions of other stockholders. For the remainder of the debt due him by the company, he has accepted treasury stock at par. This extinguishes the last of the debt except \$1,500 to John A. Becker, which bears interest at six per cent and should be paid off as soon as possible, \$3,500 to Alexander Kerr which bears four per cent and can be paid at the convenience of the company, and \$1,900 in sums of \$50 to \$500 to various stockholders, drawing four per cent or no interest at all, and for the most part payable on sixty days' notice. The total burden of interest is now reduced to a little less than \$300 a year, while the publishing house is now doing a business of over \$15,000 a year, with every prospect for a rapid increase from this figure in the near future.

If profit were our object, we should soon be in a position to realize it. But profit is not our object. While the stockholders retain the present management in control, the money received from the sale of books and of stock will be used to pay off the remaining debt, so as to put the publishing house on an absolutely secure foundation, and to increase the output of the best obtainable literature on socialism and science at the lowest possible prices.

Do you want to help? If so, and if already a stockholder, send a cash order in advance for the new books we are announcing, or a deposit to apply on future orders. If you have from \$50 to \$1,000 that you will not need for a few months, lend it to the company at four per cent to be returned on sixty days' notice. It is not likely that such loans will be needed after the end of 1907.

If not a stockholder, send ten dollars at once for a share of stock. If you have not the ten dollars, send a dollar a month ten months. Book list and particulars on request.

Charles H. Kerr & Company (Co-operative),

56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

FEBRUARY, 1906

NO. 8

A Socialist Sociology.

IN NO field are the gains of socialism more striking than in that of technical sociology. In spite of antagonism toward the proletarian standpoint by those who write the books the fundamental doctrines of socialism are surely and with considerable rapidity permeating the whole of the new science of sociology. It is exceptionally gratifying that in just the degree that the basic principles of socialism are adopted, do modern sociological works gain in value, and this measured not by the judgments of socialists, but by even the bourgeois students of society. For these reasons we have no hesitation in saying that the recent work on "General Sociology" by Prof. Albion W. Small of the University of Chicago is by far the greatest contribution yet made to the science of sociology. He announces as his thesis that "The central line in the path of methodological progress is marked by gradual shifting of effort from analogical representation of social structures to real analysis of social processes." Stripped of its somewhat scholastic terms this is simply saying that the modern sociologist has stopped comparing society to an organism, human or otherwise and is studying the actual course of social events.

After a discussion of the subject matter, definitions, history, and problems of sociology he proceeds to set forth his own philosophy and this is the way he starts, "In the beginning were interests." The socialist may well start at this familiar phraseology, but there is more to follow. He tells us that "the social process is a continuous formation of groups around interests,"

*) General Socio'ogy by Albion W. Small. University of Chicago Press. Cloth, 729 pages, \$4.00 net.

and "The whole life-process, so far as we know it, whether viewed in its individual or its social phase, is at last the process of developing, adjusting, and satisfying interests." Once more, "Sociology might be said to be the science of human interests and their working under all conditions." This idea is italicized and repeated over and over again until there can be no doubt of the author's position.

He goes on to tell us that "the conspicuous element in the history of the race so far as it has been recorded is universal conflicts of interest." One naturally looks for a foot note at this point referring to the phrase in "The Communist Manifesto" stating that "The whole history of mankind has been a history of class struggles," but he does not find it, although we are told once more, that "The latest word of sociology is that human experience yields the most and deepest meaning when read from first to last in terms of the evolution, expression, and accommodation of interests," and that "each class wants either to retain or to increase its power to enforce its own estimate of its own economic rights."

After this, who shall say that the socialists have not conquered the sociologists. But this is but the beginning. When he comes to discuss the "Types of Antagonistic Interest in States" he follows the socialist doctrine still further. He points out that "There is a difference between danger to an interest or to the standard of life represented by a particular class, and danger which may threaten the individual existence of persons within the class," something which socialists have expended tons of paper and gallons of ink to try to explain to those who were unable to distinguish between individual and class interests.

When he comes to take up the struggle between the capitalists and the working class we find him stating plainly that:

"In the first place, capital itself produces nothing. It earns nothing. This is contrary to general economic presumptions, and all forms of orthodox economic doctrine covertly or expressly appropriate certain amounts of inference from the opposite assumptions to buttress their own positions. Capital puts in a claim to the spoils of struggle in the economic and political field, just as though it were an active factor in production. Capital claims for itself a portion of the product of industry. This is quite different from the valid claim of the capitalist as a laborer to his share of values produced. Incidental to its pushing of this claim, capital collects a share of industrial products in the form of interest, profits, dividends, etc. In other words, the capitalist collects, besides his personal dues as a laborer, another portion of products credited to the impersonal factor, capital."

Neither is he blind to the fact pointed out by Marx that the capitalist is always a capitalist for the sake of the working class or the state, as the following quotation will show:

"The capitalist is prone to deny the soft impeachment, whenever he is accused of legal or moral wrong in advancing capitalistic interests. He

is sustained by an unfaltering sense of support by the State, and he comes to feel that honor and emolument go, in the case of his class at least, where honor and emolument are due. Because the capitalist wants the continued favor of the State, it is for his interest that public measures should always maintain programs to which the capitalist will be indispensable. It is for his interest that the State shall always be in need of money. He is interested in promoting vast undertakings far ahead of effective demand, except that stimulated by capitalistic instincts. Capital is tempted to promote excessive and artificial commerce, overproduction at certain points, overpopulation at others. In these artificial conditions, capital is sure to find employment. It can exert monopolies, collect its interest, control its incidental losses, and make them fall most heavily on the class of small capital or the various labor interests."

The impossibility of the middle class acting effectively is seen and we are told that "The middle rank has no firm bond of coherence because its members seize every opportunity to become or seem to become members of the upper rank." Here he is approaching closer and closer to the inevitable conclusion. One step further is taken along the track when he tells us that the "social problem is to give freest scope to those interests which actually require for their realization the largest sum of other interests." Only one more step would have been necessary and that would have been to have carried this chapter to its logical conclusion by pointing out that in our present society it is the proletariat which does require the largest sum of interests for the realization of its aims. Had he done this the chapter might easily have served as a socialist propaganda leaflet.

Not only is the doctrine of the class struggle accepted,—its foundation, the materialistic interpretation of history is also recognized. Indeed it would seem in the beginning as if he intended to out-Marx Marx when he states that "Every social question, from electing a Pope down to laying out a country road, is in the last analysis a question of what to do in the face of grudging soil, and the cruel climate, and the narrow space, of the region from which we get our food," and "If we should pass in review all the social theorizings of the last century no more frequent vice would be in evidence than some form of virtual denial that social conduct must square with the requirements of physical surroundings." He even instances specifically the one great historical event which has been most frequently alleged as offering an exception to the materialistic interpretation of history and declares that, "We might find also that the crusades were less inspired by piety than by poverty, and that this poverty was primarily the correlate of outraged physical law."

He also quotes with approval the following from Prof. John Dewey:

"His thesis is that occupations determine the fundamental modes of human activity; and that the occupation presupposing different immediate and remote objects of desire, and requiring variations in fundamental modes of activity, produces variations of mental type, including variations

of desires. For instance, the hunting life differs in turn from the agricultural, the pastoral, the military, the trading, the manually productive, the intellectual, etc. Each of these different kinds of life presents distinct classes of problems. Each stimulates its peculiar classes of desire. Each promotes the formation of peculiar habits, in adapting effort to satisfaction of the desires. Each of these types of habit, formed by an earlier and necessary stage in conquering the conditions of life, tends to persist; it reappears as a modifier of the impulses and habits that survive, because more appropriate, in a later stage."

Certainly no socialist ever claimed more than this for the materialistic interpretation of history. Indeed his later statement of Prof. Dewey is practically an adaptation of the introduction to "The Communist Manifesto" and Marx's preface to his "Critique of Political Economy," yet no reference is given to either of these. As is the usual case with sociological writers credit is given to Loria, whose notorious plagiarism in this direction should be familiar to every scholar, so frequently has it been exposed. Indeed he goes even further than this and in a foot note implies that "Marx and his followers" have somehow evolved something else as a materialistic interpretation of history and gives as a reference on this point Masaryk's *Die Grundlagen des Marxismus!* The Marxian who knows anything about Masaryk's work realizes that this is about the limit of unfairness.

He recognizes the fact which the socialists have long been pointing out that a sociology which does not concern itself with social betterment is a fruitless and useless study and speaks as strongly on this as any one could ask.

It will be manifestly unfair, however, to Dr. Small to treat him simply as a copyist of the socialists; indeed there is every reason to believe that he has reached his conclusions independent of and ignorant of the socialist writings. He has done very much more than this, he has developed and synthesized lines of thought as no socialist writer has done. He has given a much more satisfactory survey of sociological thought in his historical portion than anything hitherto published. He actually passes from a static to the dynamic stage in sociology, and he has succeeded in this direction far better than even Ward. We do not believe that it is too much to say that methodologically he has laid down the lines along which the sociologists of the future must work and this is all that he has claimed to do. But he really has done more. In the part dealing with the "Social Process Considered as a System of Ethical Problems" he has written what, in our opinion, is by far the strongest and best statement of social ethics (and there can be no other kind of ethics) that has ever appeared. His beginning is especially suggestive:

"Modern men are puzzled and perplexed and baffled by the incidents of their own activities. Political and industrial facts are the best illustrations, but in using them we must insist that they are illustrative

merely. They are not the whole or the most of life. The production of wealth in prodigious quantities, the machine-like integration of the industries, the syndicated control of capital and the syndicated organization of labor, the conjunction of interests in production and the collision of interests in distribution, the widening chasm between luxury and poverty, the security of the economically strong and the insecurity of the economically weak, the domination of politics by pecuniary interests, the growth of capitalistic world-politics, the absence of commanding moral authority, the well-nigh universal instinct that there is something wrong in our social machinery and that society is gravitating toward a crisis, the thousand and one demands for reform, the futility or fractionality of most ameliorative programs—all these are making men wonder how long we can go on in a fashion that no one quite understands and that everyone feels at liberty to condemn."

In short, Prof. Small recognizes that "Society is ethically bankrupt. We have some ethical assets but they are a small percentage of our abilities. Speaking generally, your ethical capital consists of a heterogeneous collection of provincial moralities.".....

Sociology alone can furnish this "ethical capital." Once more he admits that the socialists were right when they ridiculed and condemned those sociologists who dwelt in the realm of "pure science" and refused to consider the practical application of their principle. "Sociology," he tell us "would have no sufficient reason for existence if it did not contribute at least to a knowledge of what is worth doing." When he comes to determine his standard of ethics he once more finds himself in accord with the socialists. To show just how true this is we present the two following quotations:

"All the systems of ethics, and all the codes of morals, have been men's gropings toward ability to express this basic judgment: That is good, for me or for the world around me, which promotes the on-going of the social process. That is bad, for me or for the world around me, which retards the on-going of the social process."

Again:

"This social process is continuous advance in the development, adjustment, and satisfaction of the health, wealth, sociability, knowledge, beauty, and rightness desires."—Small, "General Sociology," pp. 676 and 707.

"In each and every stage of society the test of the fitness of any system of ethics lies in the proof that it does or does not conform to those conditions which make for the progress of the race. By progress is here meant an increasing control by man over the forces of nature; a greater ability to make them serve his comfort and perform his tasks; in short, a growing mastery of his environment. This greater control is equivalent to a higher development of the human race."—May Wood Simons in "International Socialist Review," Dec. 1900.

We hope no one will misunderstand the placing of these quotations in parallel columns as in the least an insinuation of plagiarism on the part of Prof. Small. Such a suggestion is the furthest from our minds. We do this simply to show how as fast as the new science of sociology really attains anything

worth while it does so by approaching closer and closer to the position which socialists have held for half a century. That he, himself really realizes that fact is seen by the following quotation taking from almost the last chapter of his-book :

"The type of life that civilization has developed calls for a type of persons capable of the most intensely refined and many-sided co-operation. Ability to fit into an infinitely refined and complex system of co-operation is the mark of fitness for the present social environment. At the same time democracy has given to the individual both demand and capacity for a share in consumption of all the achievements of civilization. Unless this demand is measurably satisfied, the fitness of the individual for his part in co-operation is reduced toward the point of obstruction. That is: On the most cynical basis of calculation which could be adopted, the program of civilization is a system of inevitable co-operation. If control of the co-operation were in the hands of one despot, he would be obliged, in order to keep the system from breaking down, to run it in the interest of all the persons necessary for the co-operation. To do this, he would be obliged to run it on a plan which would admit all the persons necessary to the co-operation to progressive participation in all the advantages of the co-operation."

Here he has practically summed up for a co-operative commonwealth as the logical conclusion of his work.

On the whole this book must be considered a part of socialist literature and a contribution to the socialist analysis of society. To be sure he is not always consistent. There are points where he modifies his materialism and attempts to explain away his acceptance of the class struggle. Yet taking the book as a whole we believe that the future historian of the socialist movement will classify it as a part of the literature of the International Socialist movement.

A. M. SIMONS.

Revolutionary Anthem.

by U. O. Hison.

Arise, ye wage cursed sons of toil,
Ye fatherlandless sons who moil
Your lives in poverty;
Arise to manhood's glorious
height,
Assert it an eternal right,
And win it by your Titan might—
A comrade liberty.

CHORUS:

Arise a conquering band!
No more shall masters base infest
A world of comrade brothers
blest;
From every land, extend the hand
Of comradeship unto the rest
At Liberty's behest.

Arise, ye tillers of the soil,
Ye too are comrade sons of toil;
List to the ages call
Aye shed the horny callous hand
Base brutal masters praise as
grand,
And drive these vampires from
the land,
The land God gave to all.

Arise, ye toilers with the mind
In comrade fellow workers find
Blest solidarity;
Contemptuous tyrannies that gall,
Fight till the last of you shall fall
Or till ye win the world for all—
For all humanity.

Arise! Arise! Time's spirit calls
On you to batter down the walls
Of base oppression's day;
In this the ages' striking hour,
A mighty giant hof ye tower;
Did ye but know your latent
power
Your will none could gainsay.

Aye, angry Demos now hurl down
The savage terror of your frown
On who your rights disown;
Your tendons firm as damask
steel

In mighty arms, let tyrant feel
The conquering power they wield
The future is your own.

Strike off the master's galling
chain,
Demand as your rightful domain
Fair foster mother earth;
Her all abundant fruitfulness
Shall satisfy your dire distress,
With plenty shall your children
bless—
The world shall have rebirth.

Press on! Press on! Unto the
goal
Where from the enthralled human
soul
Constricting fetters fall;
Press on! Ye have a world to
gain
And nought to lose but galling
chain
Your ignorance binds with fret-
ting pain
Till freedom's won for all.

Stretch forth your powerful cun-
ning hands
And cull from all the outstretched
lands
Beneath God's generous sun
All art the ages hitherto
Have wrought ideally for you;
A purer art shall rise for you
When ye the world have won.

O'erthrow contemptuous mastery,
Destroy the curse of wavery;
The great are only great
Because unto their pride you
kneel;
Arise! Contempt for you they feel,
Humility invites the heel
To worse your abject state.

The master's hand is at your
throats,
In haughty pride he o'er you
gloats,

Your sweated blood's his toll;
 In luxury and elegance
 He teaches you your fate is
 chance,
 He cures you with ignorance.
 His hauteur covers your soul.

Arise and damn the master's
 power
 In the righteous avenging hour
 Of the triumphant cause;
 Your soul, oh Demos, he would
 slay,
 Your daughters fair have been his
 prey,
 Your sons, his slaves for paltry
 pay—
 Annul his cursed laws.

Rejoice! our masters built on sand
 A tottering realm that cannot
 stand

Its fall e'en now they wail;
 They built on privilege and class,
 Corroding elements that pass;
 Ye build on unity and mass.
 Your cause can never fail.

Ye are the basic social rock
 The clashing class strife ne'er
 shall shock,

Whereon shall stately rise
 Builded in all, on all, for all—
 The commonwealth that cannot
 fall,

A refuge from the tyrant thrall
 Of blood-stained centuries.

Arise, ye sons of destiny,
 Ye patrons of equality,
 A compact sturdy band!
 With gleaming light from Orient
 skies
 Streaming into your waking eyes

Move forward to the fight!
 Arise!
 Go forth possess the land!

Arise! Arise! Ye cannot fail!
 Shall aught that's base with you
 avail

To crucify your cause?
 Shall generations still unborn
 The craven soul in their sires
 scorn?

Ye shall your lives and theirs
 adorn

If ye fulfil Time's laws.

Exult in your exuberant youth,
 Boldly in Time's evolving truth,
 Save the expanding soul;
 Arise, your youthful form unbend
 In God-like stature stand as men,
 Regain ye savage rights as when
 No master smote the soul.

Grasp in your mind the latent
 power,
 Revealed in this, Time's dawning
 hour,

Of science, music, art
 Forge from them weapons for
 your fight
 And battle on for Time and Right
 Against the forces of the night
 That blight the human heart.

In North, in South, in East, in
 West
 From age long strife in joy be
 blest

Nor slave nor master be
 In comrade love ye all shall reign
 When strength of arm and power
 of brain

The heritage of mankind gain
 A comrade liberty.

Materialism and Socialism.

II.

BEFORE leaving fundamentals and the consideration of inorganic nature, in our discussion, I wish to call attention to some other difficulties in the way of a rational mechanical explanation of the universe.

CONSERVATION OF ENERGY AND INDESTRUCTIBILITY OF MATTER IN DOUBT.

The phenomena of the X-rays and of radium have left the questions of conservation of energy and the indestructibility of matter in doubt. Indeed, many physicists admit that these supposed fully demonstrated principles may be but approximations to the truth, as Boyle's law has been shown to be though it was long thought to be rigidly true. There are no *a priori* reasons for supposing them true. But assuming that they are true, as seems probable as far as our inductions have gone,

THE PRINCIPLE OF DISSIPATION OF ENERGY

is as well established as that of conservation. The sun is continually pouring out its flood of radiant energy, of which but an infinitesimal portion is intercepted and held by the planets. And the planets themselves are radiating far more energy into space than they receive. Likewise every star is dissipating energy; though an occasional collision in space transforms the molar motion of the colliding bodies into heat and light, which, again, is radiated into space. The ultimate result of this process must be, in finite time, the transformation of all energy into some one or more of the radiant forms, viz., light, heat, electricity, and the establishing of an equilibrium of motion throughout the interstellar ether. This must be the end of all life—all change in matter; since heterogeneity shall have been destroyed, and in its place, an infinite homogeneity; all matter shall have given up its motion to the all-pervailing ether. There can be no mechanical process conceived, undirected by intelligence, by which the molar motion and the unequal diffusion of energy and matter can be restored. Thus do our rational processes take us inevitably to the time when the machinery of the universe has run down, its motive power existing only in the form of an infinitely diffused vibration.

The corollary of this proposition is that the present condition of non-equilibrated forces (or energy) has been in prog-

ress in finite time only—had its beginning at some time in the finite past; for in less than infinite time all of the energies of the universe would have been dissipated, and the universe would now be dead.

CURVED SPACE, LIMITED SPACE, ETC.

The ideas of "limited space," "curved space," space of "fourth, fifth, and higher dimensions," which might have some bearing on the questions at issue, must be passed by as ideas of an illegitimate order. If they exist in fact, as some high mathematical authorities have contended to be possible and probable, they transcend all our powers of cognition, and must be placed in the category of those mysterious and inconceivable things, ideas, and states often assumed to explain other mysteries; they give us no rational explanation.

It will not be necessary to consider further the difficulties to be met by the materialist in attempting to give a rational explanation of the phenomena of inorganic nature; suffice it to say that difficulties and insurmountable barriers are to be met at every step of his progress from matter to life, the subject which I shall next briefly discuss.

THE FORMULA OF EVOLUTION.

Herbert Spencer has attempted to sum up all the processes of nature and express them in a single formula, as follows:

"Evolution is the integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation."

This formula has been quite generally accepted by materialists, and many others, indeed, as stating a general law of the universe, established by the widest induction. But the present writer, in a pamphlet published in 1892, demonstrated mathematically, from data supplied by the great physicists, that this formula does not apply to organic nature; that instead of the integration being accompanied by a dissipation of motion (energy), it is accompanied by an absorption and inclusion of motion. (A Critical Essay on the "Law" of the "Integration of Matter and Concomitant Dissipation of Motion.") If this be true (and the proof has never yet been successfully controverted) we have in life a process, or factor, we might say, restoring the non-equilibrium of forces—catching the radiant energy in its flight from the sun and storing it up in aggregates of high potentiality, a reversal of the supposed "universal law of dissipation." The mechanical theory here fails again; it cannot give us the *modus operandi* of

the change from energy of low potentiality to that of a higher, from a vibratory energy to that which appears to be devoid of all motion, but which at the same time is capable of being transformed into energy of molecular or molar motion. It is as though in a steam boiler aggregates of molecules were to form having a higher pressure (a greater amount of internal motion) than that of the surrounding atmosphere of steam. Only by some such hypothesis as the goblins proposed by J. Clerk Maxwell to show how intelligence may catch energy of a high-speed and release only that of the lower-speed particle, can the non-equilibrium be restored. We are wont to explain these phenomena by attributing them to the selective power of life; but this explanation implies intelligence.

THE MYSTERY OF LIFE.

We are met at the threshold of this discussion with the question, "What is life, and how does live matter differ from dead matter?" Many philosophers have attempted to answer this question, and, from a materialistic standpoint, Spencer's definition is probably as good as any which has been made. He says, "Life in all of its manifestations, inclusive of intelligence in its highest forms, consists in the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations."

Grant this to be true, how can the blind, clashing atoms or molecules effect this adjustment? In what consists the difference that live matter adjusts and dead matter does not? How does the vegetable organism wrench the atom of carbon from its combined oxygen, appropriating the one and discarding the other? If the living organism be but a perfected machine, it should always act in accordance with the fixed and undeviating laws of mechanics. A steam shovel or dredge scoops up mud, stones, and other matter indiscriminately, with a uniform absence of utility and design. The vegetable organism selects what is useful and necessary to its growth in a manner indicative of selective intelligence. A bubble of marsh gas in passing through the superincumbent stratum of water takes a vertically upward course as the line of least resistance. If an inverted jar of water be immediately above, the bubble is caught in the jar and can never descend through the water to escape under the edge of the jar. It is not so with the frog; if he finds himself caught, after surveying his prison and finding no other avenue of escape he descends to escape by the only avenue open to him. It will be urged that the vibratory energy of heat and light dissociates the carbonic dioxide in the leaf of the vegetable organism, setting free the oxygen and leaving the carbon behind. Very good; but how does it happen that this same vibratory energy comes

in contact with an infinite number of molecules of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere and none are dissociated except those brought in contact with the living vegetable cell? And further, when dissociation has been effected how does the atom of carbon enter and become a constituent part of the cell? To this last question it will doubtless be urged that the cell is formed by chemical affinity. Many interrogations might be made as to this chemical affinity of which so much is required, but space forbids. I will, however, call attention to the fact that all of our organic chemistry in the laboratory is confined to tearing down organic cells; and the building up of a single cell has never been effected except through the agency of life.

When an organism dies the chemical forces as we know them in the laboratory assert themselves and the organic cell breaks down, the constituent elements going into new and more stable compounds. From these phenomena it would appear that life so overrules and directs the chemical forces that they form compounds such as are never formed in the absence of life, and which cannot be maintained intact except in the presence of the life which formed them.

FROM MATTER TO MIND AN IMPASSABLE GULF.

When we come to consider the phenomena of mind we can conceive of no possible way by which mind can be expressed in terms of matter. How can we identify the objective vibration of air with the subjective sensation of sound; light vibration with light; or any object with the sensation or idea of it?* We may trace a parallelism between sensation and ideas and their corresponding brain events, but that one can become the other we cannot conceive. Spencer, Huxley, and Tyndall recognized the gulf between mind and matter as impassable, yet each with characteristic looseness of logic ignored the gulf and actually treated it as passed by a continuous series of steps from the original nebula to the highest forms of thought. This uncritical attitude of mind is assumed by all materialistic philosophers, with lofty expressions of contempt for what they term metaphysics, whenever one adverts to their irrationality. The automatists of the school represented by Spencer and Huxley regard consciousness as a sort of "epiphenomenon" accompanying the physical events of the brain, but having nothing to do with these phenomena—having no causal relation to any physical event. Mind appears at a certain stage in development as an

* The best explanation Haeckel can give us of the operations of mind in consciousness is to call it a reflection, or image, of the external fact; the brain being the mirror which images the external world. But how the consciousness, the awareness, comes into being, he fails to explain. To tell us that it is an image, or picture, tells us nothing of the fact.

"illegitimate birth" of so small a magnitude that it fails to attract attention; and when it grows into a large-sized fact, it is only necessary to trace it to its small beginning to satisfactorily account for it. Such in substance is the characterization given by Prof. William James to the automatist's "Development of Mind." But it would appear that the automatist's process is not worthy to be called a birth at all; it is without father or mother—a pure assumption, a scientific(?) "hand-me-down," the maker of which is not even suspected of an existence outside the brain of the philosopher who assumes it.

UNCRITICAL REASONING OF MATERIALISTIC MONISTS.

Of all the exponents of materialistic monism (or automatism) none are bolder in assumption or more rash in ignoring reason, causation, design, than Prof. Ernest H. Haeckel of the University of Jena. He places the terms into a series in accordance with his view of evolution, and behold! the "Riddle of the Universe" is resolved.* He quotes with approval J. C. Vogt's theory of substance (styled the Pyknotic Theory: Pyknatoms with Souls), which is nearly as rational and intelligible (though not quite) as Madam Blavatsky's theosophical explanation of mind, matter, souls, and the several different bodies belonging thereto.

* Professor Haeckel quotes from Emil du Bois-Reymond, from a lecture delivered in 1890 in the Leibnitz session of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, and disposes of the difficulties enumerated by the lecturer in a very brief and summary manner. The ease with which Professor Haeckel disposes of difficulties is seen from the enumeration and comment made by the professor given herewith. By du Bois-Reymond: (1) "The nature of matter. (2) The origin of motion. (3) The origin of life. (4) The (apparently pre-ordained) orderly arrangement of nature. (5) The origin of simple sensation and consciousness. (6) Rational thought, the origin of the cognate faculty, speech. (7) The question of the freedom of the will." Comment by Professor Haeckel: "Three of these seven enigmas are considered by the orator of the Berlin Academy to be entirely transcendent and insoluble—they are the first, second, and fifth; three others (3d, 4th, and 6th) he considers capable of solution, though extremely difficult; as to the seventh, the last world enigma, the freedom of the will, which is of the greatest practical importance, he remains undecided. As my monism differs materially from that of the Berlin orator, and as his idea of the 'seven great enigmas' has been very widely accepted, it may be useful to indicate their true position at once. In my opinion the three transcendental problems (1, 2, and 3) are settled by our conception of substance (vide chap. xii); the three which he considers difficult, though soluble (3, 4, and 6) are decisively answered by our modern theory of evolution; the seventh and last, the freedom of the will, is not an object for critical study, scientific inquiry, at all, for it is a pure dogma, based on an illusion, and has no real existence."

The conception of substance which Professor Haeckel refers to is that above mentioned from J. C. Vogt, which has nothing to recommend it. It is mathematically impossible, and in no way can explain mass, gravitation, chemism, or any of the properties of matter. Dalton's atomic theory, now known to be impossible, goes much farther to explain observed phenomena. Haeckel's reference to the 'modern theory of evolution' to explain the 3d, 4th, and 6th enigmas is to take a little life and allow it to grow; to take a little mind, primordial sensation, for example, and allow it to develop according to the law of attraction of likes, etc.; to take the original chaos, allow the fortuitous clashes to transform themselves into eddies, rhythms, etc., and, presto, all is explained. And as to free will, the universe is a machine, man is a machine, an automaton, and no machine can have any will, since it is governed by immutable law; therefore, free will in man is a dogma and not an object for critical study, etc. Such is the force of Haeckel's argumentation, in logical consistency and acumen unworthy of a child who has reached the age of twelve years. Yet, he is looked up to as one of the great lights of materialistic monism.

THE PSYCHOLOGIST'S FALLACY.

Objectively and scientifically we know sound as air or some other medium vibrating longitudinally. These vibrations impinge on the tympanum of the ear and are conveyed by nerve fibers to the brain. We have reason to believe, also, that there is a brain event corresponding to these vibrations. But the subjective sensation of sound is a phenomenon of a different order which no one would think of identifying with the vibration. The sensation, the feeling, the consciousness,—what is it, and how does it arise? To say that the mind mirrors the objective world helps us not at all. Can we imagine the mirror conscious of what it reflects; the telescope objective, of the image it builds in the focus of the eye-piece or the eye? We may doubtless imagine it as analogous to the formation of an image in the eye, of which consciousness takes cognizance; but we cannot believe in the consciousness of a mere mechanism, however perfect. The materialistic monist has no use for consciousness; and as it has no place in his mechanical scheme, he calls it an "epiphenomenon," a sort of "by-product of the brain," a "spectator of operations, but one which has nothing whatever to do with them."

The universal practice of associationalists, and some others perhaps, of attributing the thinker's knowledge and experience to the thing thought of and experienced, has been very appropriately designated the psychologist's fallacy.

THE GULF BETWEEN MIND AND MATTER IGNORED.

The impossibility of passing from matter to mind by any series of continuous transition steps or gradations is recognized by nearly all philosophers. Spencer, Huxley, and Tyndall never attempted, as far as the present writer is aware, to bridge the chasm between material and psychic phenomena. They were content to assume life and mind at successive stages of evolution, as they assume matter at the beginning of the process. Others, like Professor Bain, assumed the double aspect theory of matter,—that mind and material properties are merely two aspects of one and the same underlying substance, the two sides of the same shield. This connecting of the two classes of phenomena, however, is a mere verbal subterfuge which does not explain. It is a dualism in which two entirely different orders of phenomena are tied together by some unknown and mysterious nexus. In the objective world we know mind as connected with matter only under certain peculiar conditions and circumstances. The double aspect view leads to parallelism in philosophy with no causal relation between the two classes of phenomena. Boscovich's atomic theory of points of force has been modified by making the points of force mental; and this theory has much in common with idealism, or perhaps with

the mental monadism of Leibnitz, Herbart, and Lotze, differing principally from idealism in its multiplicity of mental units in the place of one, and in regarding space and time as having an actual objective existence, absolute, or independent of all subjective relations. Again, Clifford put forward his mind stuff theory postulating an original material of mind as well as of matter, both eternal in existence, or indestructible. This likewise leads to parallelism in philosophy, with no causal nexus between mind and matter.

PLURALISM CANNOT BE FUSED INTO UNITY.

The great objection to all these theories here but briefly alluded to, is in their pluralism. We cannot conceive of the union of a number of mental units to form another mental unit. The same difficulty arises in conceiving the human mind and consciousness as made up of lesser mental units and consciousnesses, as we find in conceiving a separate and higher consciousness of a body of individuals. We may speak figuratively of a class conscious; but we cannot believe that there is a mind and consciousness of the body of individuals in any sense above or distinct from the several individual minds and consciousnesses. To make the mind a colony of lesser minds is in every sense repugnant to our rationality.

AN ANIMATED, CONSCIOUS UNIVERSE.

Still another theory is that the whole universe of matter is animated and conscious, every particle having all the attributes of matter and mind. This differs slightly, if at all, from Bain's double aspect theory, though it would seem to give room for freedom of will, will being one of the attributes of each particle of matter. This assumption, however, leads us into another difficulty in accounting for the uniform behavior of matter, chemically and physically, when placed under like conditions. If atoms have free will, then we should expect variety in behavior of like atoms placed under like conditions. Experience seems to negative this assumption.

HIGHER MENTAL PROCESSES.

All materialistic systems of psychology pursue analogous methods, in the treatment of mind, to those adopted in explanation of physical phenomena. Certain nervous discharges follow certain paths of least resistance in the brain and give rise to habit, reflexes, and all unconscious action. Repetition determines certain main paths of nervous discharge to the exclusion of other minor paths of smaller discharge; and thus skill arises through such repetition. An impression once made on the brain is retained; and ever after an impression made by a

similar force and in a similar manner goes in part, at least, by the old path and the old impression is wholly or in part repeated, this repetition being called memory. The new impression brings up the old by a process known as the "law of association." By like analogies this law is extended to the uniting of likes and the differentiation of unlikes; and new images are produced in imagination. The fitting together of likes and the non-fitting of unlikes gives us the rational process of comparison. The arrangement of events in time, as prior or subsequent, and the fixed recurrence of such order give rise to the idea of causation.

These explanations seem at first sight plausible, but when examined critically they are seen to be a mere rope of sand. The materialistic psychologist places these things and events in juxtaposition and rational order, and in thought transfers the doing to the things and processes themselves. He sees the rational order and reasons that the things and processes can see and be conscious of the same order. He sees the vibrations follow a certain law which he has discovered, and he transfers this seeing to the vibrations themselves. The coherence of these things and processes is no coherence at all. They only appear coherent by the web woven about them by the psychologist's own mind. He can imagine a rope of sand to be tensible and coherent; but in fact it does not cohere. And so the building up of mind by his so-called laws of association is only coherent in his imagination; the elements are disparate things which cannot be fused together.

The foregoing brief argument is sufficient to show the utter inadequacy of mechanism to explain mind; and for the present I shall leave this branch of the discussion, reserving the third article for a discussion of the necessary consequences of materialistic logic.

CHAS. H. CHASE.

(To be continued.)

The Great Contradiction in the Marxian Theory of Value.

WE have seen in the preceding articles that the facts relied on by Marx-critics to "refute" Marx fail them signally when put to the test. These facts rather tally with the Marxian theory. While, however, this may be sufficient to parry the attacks of these Marx-critics and work the discomfiture of all those who should attempt to attack Marx with the weapons of "logic" and "facts of experience," this does not furnish the highest kind of *positive* proof of the correctness of the Marxian theory demanded by Marx himself and his followers. Marx and the Marxists have often been reproached for being too strict and exacting. This they undoubtedly are. But first of all, with *themselves*, Marx has often been accused of being addicted to tedious repetitions in his writing, his critics being unable to see that Marx merely approached his subject from all justifiable points of view in order to make sure that his conclusions were correct. We have already stated before that he never rested his case on purely logical deductions. These only served him as a means of grasping and explaining the *facts* which must in each case supply the proof. But in looking to the *facts* for his proofs, he was not content merely with the ordinary facts of "experience" in the sense in which his critics understand the term. Of course, these had to tally with his conclusions before he adopted them, but they merely gave him the *prima facie* proof. True to his historical ideas, the real decisive proof he sought in the facts of history, or, rather, in the "facts of experience" considered in their historical setting and connection.

So it was with his theory of Value and Surplus Value. Considering that the question of value lies at the very foundation of the capitalistic mode of production and distribution, he insisted that a theory of value in order to be accepted as correct, must not only be in accordance with the facts as they are, but it must furnish a key to the understanding of capitalistic *development*, to the understanding of the *facts of capitalism in their movement*. It must explain not only the statics of capitalism, but its dynamics. A theory of surplus-value, in order to be accepted as correct must show the sources and volume of the profits of the capitalist class not only as they exist to-day, but throughout the

entire historical epoch dominated by the capitalistic mode of production and distribution. It must account for the different variations in these profits, if any be discovered. It *must explain the development of profits*.

And it is here that the Marxian theory has to record its greatest triumph. In philosophy as well as in economics, it is its historical character that gives the Marxian theory its peculiar import, that forms its essence. What does the history of capitalistic profits show? If there is anything that is well established in connection with capitalistic profits, it is the tendency of the *rate of profit on capital* to diminish. With the development of capitalism and the *growth of the mass of capital*, the return on capital in the shape of profits is constantly becoming smaller. While the gross amounts of profits obtained by the capitalist class is constantly increasing with the growth of the mass of capital, the amount of the profits in proportion to the whole capital employed, and therefore, the *rate of profit on a given amount of capital*, tends to constantly diminish. This is known in political economy as the "law of the falling rate of profit." Whence this law? How account for the falling rate of profit? No theory of value before or after Marx could give a satisfactory answer to these questions. As Marx said of the science of political economy as he found it:—

"She saw the phenomenon (of the falling rate of profit) and was agonized by attempts at conflicting explanations. Because, however, of the great importance of this law for capitalistic production, it may be said, that this law forms the great mystery about the solving of which the whole science of political economy revolves ever since the days of Adam Smith. And that the difference between the different schools of the science since Adam Smith consists in the different attempts to solve this problem."

There is no such mystery, however, when the Marxian theory of value sheds its light on the underlying basis of the capitalistic mode of production, and the laws of its development are exposed to the light of day. Not only does the Marxian theory offer a satisfactory explanation, but such explanation flows naturally and of necessity therefrom. And it is as simple and as clear as daylight.

The capital employed by a capitalist "producer" in his business is divided into two parts:—One which he spends for his place, fixtures, machinery, raw goods, etc.; and the other which he spends in paying wages to his men, in "employing labor" as it is euphoniously styled. Let us call the capital of the first category "constant" capital, and that of the second cate-

gory "variable" capital. The reason for these appellations is because according to the Marxian theory, the first kind of capital remains constant, unchanged by the process of production, whereas the second kind of capital varies, changes, to be more specific, *increases* in that process. As was already shown, only labor creates value, and that the capitalist's profits come from the "surplus" value. When a capitalist receives a profit out of the process of production,—his capital increases in the operation,—that variation is due to the capital invested in paying for labor, the other part of his capital, the raw materials and other things can not vary themselves, they are merely reproduced, they remain a constant quantity. Let us see how the development of capitalistic production affects the two parts of capital, and what bearing this has on the rate of profit.

John Brown, Sr., went into the business of manufacturing shoes in the year of Our Lord, 1850. He started out with a capital of, let us say, \$500.00, four hundred of which he spent in fixing up his plant and buying a stock of raw material necessary in the business, and the remaining one hundred he used in paying his labor. We will assume, for the sake of simplicity, that he employed ten men, paying each ten dollars per week, and that the "turn-over" in his business was such that he cashed in every week the proceeds of his manufactured product, so that he did not need to invest for labor any more than one week's wages. Let us further assume that the state of the productivity of labor was such that the labor of one of our manufacturer's men during one week, created a product of the value of twenty dollars. (In addition, of course, to the value of the raw materials, etc. consumed in its production). Under these conditions the value of the product manufactured by John Brown, weekly, will be two hundred dollars, one hundred of which will be "necessary" value (the amount paid in wages), and one hundred, "surplus" value. This will be his profit. (In order to simplify matters, we assume that he deals with his consumers direct, thus cutting out the middlemen's share of the profit.) The ratio of the "necessary" to the "surplus" value, which we will call the rate of surplus value or the rate of the exploitation of labor, is that of 1 to 1 or 100 per cent. John Brown does not figure that way, however. While he is interested in paying his men as little as possible and make them produce as much as possible, whether by foul means or fair, he is not at all interested to know what proportion the surplus-value they create bears to their wages. Good business man that he is, he wants to know what return the capital invested by him in the enterprise has brought him. He finds that his investment of five hundred dollars has brought

him a profit (consisting of the surplus-value), of one hundred dollars, or 20 per cent. per week.

On such profits John Brown's business thrived, and he accumulated a fortune. He is now resting in peace with his forefathers, and his son and heir, John Brown, Jr., now conducts the business. John Brown, Jr., upholds the traditions of the old house for making profits. But entirely new methods and processes of manufacturing shoes are now being used by him, as well as by everybody else who is in the market to compete with him. New machinery has been invented since the days when his father started the business. This machinery is "labor-saving" to a high degree. That is to say, it increases the productivity of labor, so that one man can do by its aid the work of several working without its aid. This machinery, however, is very costly; and its employment requires a large outlay for raw materials, since a man employs more raw materials in the same proportion as the productivity of labor increases. The "composition" of his capital,—that is to say, the proportionate shares thereof used as "constant" and "variable" capitals, respectively,—is, therefore, different from the composition of his father's capital, when the old man started in business. John Brown, Jr., employs a capital of twenty thousand dollars. Of this fully nineteen thousand are used as constant capital, and only one thousand to pay for the labor employed by him. This composition of capital, because it signifies a higher stage of the development of capitalism, we will call the higher composition, and the composition of the capital at the time the business was started we will call the lower composition. Now let us see what effect did the change in the composition of the capital have on the profits of the business.

Let us assume that the firm still retains the old scale of wages. Let us also assume that owing to the introduction of the improved machinery, (and allowing for the cheapening of the product in consequence) the value of the product of a man's labor has increased two-fold. What will be the result? His variable capital amounting to one thousand dollars, John Brown now employs one hundred men. The value of the weekly product of each man is forty dollars, and the value of the aggregate weekly product, four thousand dollars. Out of this, one thousand dollars represents the necessary value and three thousand is surplus value. His profits have increased enormously, but yet not in proportion to his capital. That is to say, while the gross amount of his profits is enormous, the *rate* of his profits, the percentage return of each dollar of capital, is considerably smaller. A profit of three thousand dollars on a capital of twenty

thousand makes only fifteen per cent., a decrease of five per cent. as compared with the older days.

The different ways in which the business of the older and the younger John Brown was organized, and the results flowing from the different organizations of their business, is typical of the development of capitalistic production in general, and correctly exemplifies it. It shows the *fact* of the falling rate of profit, and also gives the explanation therefor. The development of capitalist production consisting in the increased productivity of labor by reason of which the composition of capital becomes higher, this development *must* necessarily tend to lower the *rate* of interest or profit, for the profit is *obtained* only from the variable part of capital, which is constantly being diminished as compared with the constant part, whereas it is figured on the whole capital.

Our example does not, however, show the full effect of the change of the composition of capital on the profit rate. When left to itself, the change in the composition of capital has a tendency to lower the rate of profit much more than appears from our example. The reason for it is, that in our example we did not present the workings of this law in its purity, by changing the conditions of the problem. In the first instance we represented the workingmen as receiving one-half of the value they produced, whereas in the second we assumed that they received only one-quarter. Had we left the conditions of the problem the same in the second instance as in the first, that is, one-half the labor was necessary and one-half surplus, we would have had in the second instance with even a somewhat lower composition of capital than that assumed by us, say of eighteen thousand constant and two thousand variable,—a rate of interest of only ten per cent. instead of fifteen per cent. This would show the tendency in its purity. But it would not show the actual facts of the capitalistic development. Our example does so. In outline, of course. For, with the higher composition of capital, and the greater productivity of labor which it represents, grows the surplus part of the value produced, grows the rate of exploitation of labor. And this quite irrespective of the fact whether the workingmen are getting poorer pay or not, or whether their standard of living is becoming lower or not. They may even get in *real* wages, that is, in products, more than they got before, and still the rate of exploitation will grow, for with the productivity of labor products become cheaper, so that for the same amount of money received by them as wages the workingmen may buy a larger amount of products, and yet this amount will necessarily become constantly smaller in proportion to the

amount retained by the capitalist as surplus-product. In our example we have allowed for the cheapening on products of the productivity of labor, otherwise the increase in the value of the product would have to be more than twice with such a high composition of capital. The products consumed by them being cheaper, the workingmen of John Brown, Jr., will get more products for their ten dollars per week than did their forefathers who worked for John Brown, Sr., and yet their share of the product produced will be one-half of that of their forefathers, and the rate of exploitation of labor will have increased three-fold since the times of John Brown, Sr. This is what actually happens in the course of the development of capitalistic production.

The greater productivity of labor resulting from the introduction of improved machinery gives the capitalists the possibility of increasing the rate of exploitation of labor, and they are never too slow to grasp the opportunity. This increases the *mass* of surplus-value, and consequently also the rate of profit. We, therefore, have two cross tendencies:—first, the tendency to lower the rate of profit by raising the composition of capital, thus diminishing, proportionately, the amount of variable capital which alone produces surplus-value; and second, to increase the rate of profit by increasing the rate of exploitation and thereby increasing that part of the product produced by the variable capital employed which goes to the capitalist as his surplus or profit. As the variable part of capital diminishes in proportion, the rate of exploitation grows. Of these two tendencies, however, the first is necessarily stronger, and the second can not overcome it for the simple reason that a part can not be greater, nor even as great as the whole. No matter to what proportions the rate of exploitation should grow, it can never absorb the whole product. In order that there should be a surplus product or value, there must necessarily be a necessary product or value. Any diminution, therefore, of the proportionate part of the capital employed by the capitalists as variable, must necessarily lead to some diminution of the rate profit, be it ever so small. Hence, the resultant tendency of a falling rate of profit. The actual extent of the fall will depend on the co-operation of a number of factors, no mean part being played by the success with which the capitalists will meet in their efforts to raise the rate of exploitation of labor in order to counterbalance the effects of the change in the composition of their capital.

This question of the rate of profits brings us to the so-called Great Contradiction in the Marxian theory, and to the question of the relation between the first and the third volumes of Capital. Before, however, entering upon its discussion, the present writer

wishes to say that he intends in a later work to put before the public some matters which will, in his opinion, put the whole subject in a new light. Those matters are, however, not specifically treated by Marx, and as these articles are merely intended to present the Marxian theory as *stated* by Marx, and the criticism of the theory as so stated, no reference will be made to them here, except to say that their net result does not in any way change the Marxian theory as here outlined, but amplifies it.

The Contradiction was first formulated and placed before the public in a somewhat sensational manner by Frederick Engels himself. In his preface to the second volume of *Capital*, published in 1884, after the death of Karl Marx, Engels challenged those Marxian critics of that day who had declared that Marx said nothing that was new, and that all the wisdom contained in *Capital* had already been promulgated before by Rodbertus, from whom Marx was supposed by them to have borrowed his theory of value, to explain "how an equal average rate of profit can and must be formed, not only without injury to the law of value, but really by reason thereof." He argued that if Marx said nothing new and his theory of value is no different than that of Rodbertus, these critics ought to be able to do that by the aid of Rodbertus' writings as supplemented by Marx's. This had the effect of setting a host of men to solving the problem. Most of those who attempted to accomplish the task were, however, not the Marx-critics to whom the challenge was directed, but disciples of Marx who went about the business not on the basis of Rodbertus' writings, which had very little to offer towards the solution of the problem, but on the basis of the laws of value as laid down by Marx in the first volume of *Capital*. It was the ambition of these writers to forestall the solution which Engels promised would be given by Marx himself in the third volume. In his preface to the third volume, published by him in 1894, Engels reviews the various efforts at solving this problem, and comes to the conclusion that none of them gave the correct solution, although some of them came pretty near it, notably Dr. Conrad Schmidt in his work on the subject which appeared in 1889. The correct solution, Engels says, is contained only in the third volume of *Capital* itself.

The solution of this problem, as given by Marx himself, in the third volume of *Capital*, and which is supposed to explain the great contradiction, is as follows:—

Assuming that the rate of exploitation of labor is the same in all the spheres of production in society, producing an equal rate of surplus value in all these spheres; that the capitals em-

ployed in the different spheres of production are of different degrees of composition, that is, of different character as to their division into constant and variable capital; and that nevertheless the rate of profit is equal in all the spheres of production, the problem is:—how does this come about, if the laws of value are as laid down by Marx. If two capitals, one whose composition is 90 C. plus 10 v. (90 per cent. Constant and 10 per cent. variable), and one whose composition is 10 c. and 90 v., (10 per cent. constant and 90 per cent. variable) the rate of exploitation being the same, produce the same rate of surplus-value or profit, it is quite evident that the surplus-value, and therefore, all value, must have some entirely different source than labor. But that is just what is claimed by all political economists. It is assumed to be an established fact that the rate of profits is equal at any given time in all spheres of production or circulation of commodities, no matter what the degree of the composition of the capital employed in their production. In other words, that at any given time equal capitals will give equal returns, irrespective of the particular branch of industry in which they are employed and of the composition of the capital employed in that branch. But, says Marx, the supposed fact that equal amounts of capital bring equal returns, no matter how employed, gives no indication whatever of the source of this profit. This, however, is really where the contradiction is supposed to lie. It is a contradiction of the law of value that equal amounts of capital *produce* the same amount of surplus-value irrespective of their composition. But it is no contradiction of the law of value that possessors of equal amounts of capital *receive* equal profits if it could be shown that the two capitals have produced different amounts of surplus-value, but that for some reasons, compatible with the law of value, part of the surplus produced by the capital of lower composition was transferred to the owner of the capital with a higher composition. This, says Marx, is just what actually happens wherever the law of equal return comes to the surface.

In actual life capitals of different organic composition *produce* different rates of surplus-value commensurate with the amounts of variable capital contained in them. But we have already seen before that the whole surplus-value produced by any given capital is not retained by the owner of that capital as profit on his capital. We have seen that, by reason of the social nature of capitalistic production and of the category of exchange-value, this surplus-value is distributed among a number of other capitalists, who are concerned in bringing the produced commodity to its social destination through the circulation process. All the

capitals employed in the course of the life-career of the commodity share in the surplus-value created in its production, and their share is proportionate to their size, the rate of profit for each being arrived at by a division of the surplus-value with the aggregate amount of capital used in the production and circulation of the commodity. This is accomplished through the laws of supply and demand by means of the category which we have called Price of Production, and at which commodities are actually, sold at certain stages of their existence instead of at their values.

We have seen already that it is in accordance with the laws of value as understood by us that commodities are not always sold at their values, (indeed, they seldom or never are so sold,) are, in fact, habitually sold at prices other than their values, by reason of and under certain economic conditions; and that a capitalist may, and under certain conditions usually does, receive as profits on his capital surplus-value created by some capital other than his own. The price of production at which commodities are sold at a certain stage of their existence is always below their value; and the capitalists engaged in the circulation of commodities exclusively, the merchants, get as profits on their capital surplus-value not produced by them but merely *realized* by them. The capitalists who produced this surplus-value are forced to divide up with them by the very economic conditions which permit them to retain their own proportionate share.

This principle, which we have heretofore examined with relation only to one sphere of production, must be extended to all the spheres of production wherein the law of equal return prevails. Where the law of equal return prevails in spheres of production wherein the capital employed is of different organic compositions, the prices at which the commodities are finally sold are not their actual values, but a sort of modified Prices of Production which *may* be either above or below their value, and which *will* be above their value in the branches of industry with a capital whose organic composition is above the average, and below their value in the branches of industry with a capital whose organic composition is below the average. Just as in the single commodity the surplus-value produced by one capital had to be distributed among all the capitals engaged in its production and circulation, so here the various amounts of surplus-value produced in the different spheres of production must be distributed ratably among the whole social capital or that part thereof which enters into the equalization process, that is, of those branches of industry where the law of equal return prevails. The whole social capital is regarded as one and the whole amount of surplus-value

produced in the different spheres of production is distributed ratably among the different individual capitals, by the formation of the price of production, and the goods in each branch of industry being sold according to that price of production which will consist of the value of its cost of production together with a share of profit out of the general fund of surplus-value in proportion to the size of the capital employed in its production and circulation. By means of this price of production the excess of surplus-value above the average rate produced in one sphere of production, by reason of the low organic composition of the capital employed in that sphere, will be transferred to that sphere of production wherein the amount of surplus-value produced is below the average, by reason of the high organic composition of its capital. In those branches of industry whose organic composition of capital corresponds with the average or social composition of capital, commodities will be sold at their values, their prices of production will coincide with their values; in those branches whose organic composition is above the average, the Prices of Production will be above their values in proportion to the composition of their capital; and in the branches whose composition is below the average the prices of production will be proportionately below their values.

The appearance in 1894 of the third volume of *Capital* created a sensation in interested circles. While it does not stand in any direct relation with the Revisionist movement, it can hardly be denied that it made its formal argumentation more plausible. The solution of the Great Contradiction contained in the third volume and the rest of the matter therein contained and intimately connected with this solution, opened the door for no end of discussion as to the relation between the first and third volumes of *Capital*. So that the problem to many has turned into the question how to reconcile the supposedly opposed doctrines taught in these two volumes of Marx's life work. The Great Contradiction, in the opinion of many, was not solved, but extended so as to embrace the whole Marxian theory. This was confidently asserted by all the opponents of Marxism, who drew breath. It was heralded from one end of their camp to the other, and it took its classic form in Böhm-Bawerk's, "Karl Marx and the Close of his System." The opponents of Marx were not, however, alone in this opinion. The discussion which has continued until the present day has shown that a good many Marxists, of different shades of Orthodoxy, shared in this view. So much so, that a Russian Marxist of some prominence and of strict orthodox profession of faith, being unable to reconcile the doctrines laid down in the two volumes, respectively, denied, in

his desperation, the genuineness of the "unfortunate" third volume! He claimed that because the third volume was published long after his death, and was compiled from unfinished manuscripts and random notes, Marx appears there as saying things which he really never intended to say and which are in crass contradiction to his real views which are contained only in the first volume. Engels' preface to the third volume is sufficient to show the absurdity of this assertion. So that there was the great contradiction, which made plausible the assertion that Marx completely *abandoned* his own theory of value, laid down by him in the first volume, and returned to the theory of the cost of production of the economists dubbed by him "vulgar." The half-and-half Marxists, à la Bernstein, would not go so far, (timidity and eclecticism being their specialty,) and they tried to minimize the discrepancies between the first and third volumes, claiming that Marx did not abandon his theory of value as laid down in the first volume, but merely *modified* it, on second thought, in the natural course of the *evolution* of his theory. Modification by evolution, or evolution in modification became their favorite theme.

In discussing Marx's philosophico-historic views we already had occasion to refer to this favorite theme of Revisionism. The burden of the song is that Marx's theoretical ideas had passed through an evolutionary process, the main tendency of which was from "unscientific" hard and fast monistic dogmas, at the outset, to mild and loose eclectic "science" at the conclusion. This they applied equally, and with equal justification to the whole Marxian theoretical system, to his historico-philosophic and his economic theories alike, although they failed to grasp the inner relation between these theories. Their lack of discrimination proved to be their undoing. If they had stuck to Marx's historico-philosophic views alone, they might have been able to hold their ground, as Marx's views on the subject are not contained in any treatise, are strewn over the whole mass of his writings in a more or less fragmentary condition, and it requires an intimate acquaintance with his theories to see the improbability of this claim. Not so with his economic theories. He went into elaborate discussion of all phases of the question, and the dates of the different manuscripts, with a few unimportant exceptions, are well known. And these testify aloud to the whole world of the absurdity of these assertions. It appears that most of the third volume, and particularly those portions of it which are supposed to modify the first volume, were actually written down by Marx in its present form *before the publication of the first volume!* To speak in the face of that of a *modification*, by Marx, in the third

volume of the doctrines laid down by him in the first is too palpable an incongruity to merit any particular attention. So, and even more so would be the claim of an intentional *abandonment* in the third volume of the theory of value of the first volume in favor of some other theory. We could then well afford to let the matter rest where it is. It is not so, however, with the question of a contradiction between the two volumes. If there really is such a contradiction, and if the doctrine of the third volume is a *virtual* abandonment of the labor theory of value, it makes, of course, very little difference when the different portions of Marx's book were written, or what he thought of one portion when writing the other, except, of course, as an interesting study of a great aberration of an extraordinary mind.

Professor Werner Sombart, the noted German economist, known to English readers through his graceful study "Socialism in the 19th Century," and known particularly to the readers of the REVIEW because of his recent articles on the American Labor movement, opened the discussion on the subject soon after the appearance of the third volume in an essay entitled, "Some Criticism of the Economic System of Karl Marx." In the introductory remarks of that essay Professor Sombart observes that Marx was a "most misunderstood author," and that an intelligent statement of his assertion was the highest duty of a reviewer of his work. Such a statement he undertakes to give, and goes about it very conscientiously. It must be stated, however, that notwithstanding his conscientious efforts and considerable acumen the execution fell short of the design. His conclusion, therefore, that there was contradiction between the first and third volume can not be accepted as final.

According to Sombart the theory laid down in the third volume of *Capital* is not much different from the traditional theory of the cost of production. This does not conflict, however, with the theory of value expounded in the first volume, for the simple reason that the labor theory of value was never intended by Marx to represent the actual facts, or, as he puts it, "the (Marxian) *value does not reveal itself in the exchange relation of the capitalistically-produced commodities.*" Nor does it play any part in the distribution of the yearly product of society. It has no place in real life. Its office is merely that of an aid to our thinking, by means of which we can understand the economic phenomena, and its place is in the mental operations of the economic theorist. In short, "*it is not an empirical but a mental fact.*" Value, thus banished from economic life into the realms of pure thought, can no longer come into conflict with the gross facts of this life. Its existence is none the less real, at least

to the mind of the German scholar who must have been educated on the writings of the great German idealist philosophers.

Aside from the questionable value of such "value," the chief trouble with Sombart's conception of the Marxian "value" is,—that it is not Marxian. Marx never dreamt of banishing his "value" from the real life, from the facts of actual, every-day, economic life. He not only insisted that his theory of value had an application to the actual economic life of capitalist society, but claimed that the laws of value as laid down by him *controlled* that life and *prescribed the course of its development*. He claimed that while Production Prices, and prices in general differed from the values of commodities, they were always *governed* by the laws of value and were dictated, normally, and in the last instance, by these laws. That all declination of these prices from the actual values, except accidental and temporary, are governed by the very laws of value which are supposed to be infringed thereby. Truly, Marx was "a most misunderstood author."....

We, therefore, agree, for once, with Böhm-Bawerk, that, whatever the merits of Sombart's conception of value, it does not in any way remove the contradiction in the Marxian theory of value as Marx stated it. Assuming, of course, that there is such a contradiction, if Marx intended his theory to represent the actual course of events of capitalistic production and distribution. That there is such a contradiction is assumed, as we have seen, even by some orthodox Marxists, and Marx-critics do not tire of proclaiming the fact. Says Böhm-Bawerk:

"In what relation does this doctrine of the third volume stand to the celebrated law of value of the first volume? Does it contain the solution of the seeming contradiction looked for with so much anxiety? Does it prove "how not only without contradicting the law of value, but even by virtue of it, an equal average rate of profit can and must be created?" Does it not rather contain the exact opposite of such a proof, viz., the statement of an actual irreconcilable contradiction, and does it not prove that the equal average rate of profit can only manifest itself if, and because, the alleged law of value does not hold good?"

"I see here no explanation and reconciliation of a contradiction, but the contradiction itself. Marx's third volume contradicts the first. The theory of the average rate of profit and of the price of production cannot be reconciled with the theory of value. This is the impression which must, I believe, be received by every logical thinker. And it seems to have been very generally accepted. Loria, in his lively and picturesque style, states that he feels himself forced to the "harsh but just judgment" that Marx,

"instead of a solution has presented a mystification." He sees in the publication of the third volume "the Russian campaign" of the Marxian system, its "complete theoretic bankruptcy," a "scientific suicide," "the most explicit surrender of his own teaching," and the "full and complete adherence to the most orthodox doctrine of the hated economists".

Böhm-Bawerk then quotes with approval the following passage from Sombart: "Most of them (the readers of the third volume) will not be inclined to regard "the solution" of "the puzzle of the average rate of profit" as a "solution;" they will think that the knot has been cut, and by no means untied. For, when suddenly out of the depths emerges a "quite ordinary" theory of cost of production, it means that the celebrated doctrine of value has come to grief. For, if I have in the end to explain the profits by the cost of production, wherefore the whole cumbrous apparatus of the theories of value and surplus-value?"

Slonimski says: "Contrary to all expectations the theory of surplus-value is repeatedly asserted (in the third volume); in reality however denied by its author and replaced by the old theory with all the familiar elaborations on the cost of production as the only regulators of value. The equality of profits is derived from the phantastic assumption that the capitalists amicably decide among themselves the incomes of the different undertakings, by equalizing the sums of surplus value which they separately drew from wage-labor, and that this is accomplished either by way of brotherly arrangement or through competition. As to the special surplus-value for which the rival capitalists fight so mercilessly, why that is lost sight of and plays no part either in the income of the individual capitalist, or in the establishment of the rate of profit, or in the formation of prices."

"After Marx has led us in the course of two volumes through an elaborate analysis by which he sought to prove that surplus-value is produced by hired human labor-power, he turns about and admits that all his laws and formulas are in direct conflict with reality, and cannot be brought into harmony. That surplus-value in the form of profits is yielded by every productive capital as such in equal amount, even though it be used in such a manner that *no wage-laborers are employed thereby*. Instead, therefore, of surplus-value, which we put to the credit of unpaid labor appropriated by the capitalists, we are confronted with the average rate of profits, *which is conditioned neither upon the number of workmen nor upon the degree of their exploitation, nor is it influenced by either.*"

And Masaryk declares: "*De facto* we have in the third

volume the ordinary theory of cost of production, and the law of supply and demand plays the decisive part."

"Bernstein"—says he—"admits the breach between the third and first volumes. Marx has certainly modified his theory. The theory of value of the first volume is incomplete, and therefore vulnerable, without the elaborations of the third volume. Bernstein admits that the first volume offers for the real economic relations a "sea of generalities without any shore," and that the determination of value by the quantity of labor is inadequate; a more specific measure is necessary. Commodities are exchanged not at their value but at their cost of production, the exchange-value of goods is directly determined by competition of capital, and only indirectly by the law of value. I believe that Bernstein correctly judges the Marxian teaching. The third volume speaks only too plainly against the first." And he adds:

"These expressions (of the third volume) show the *general change* in Marx's views. *We have seen* how Marx modified in the third volume his *older* definition of historic materialism — the whole third volume makes also by its tone a different impression than the first. The first volume is not so ripe. . . . Bernstein attempts another explanation of the contradiction between the *older* and the *newer* doctrines, which contradiction, as we have seen, he unqualifiedly admits."

Yes, "we have seen." We have seen how absurd it is to speak of a modification of the *older unripe* doctrine by the *newer* and riper doctrine, when the supposed older doctrine was formulated *after* the supposedly new one. . . . And this, as Masaryk himself says, applies to *all* of Marx's views, whether historico-philosophic or economic. Yet, its evident absurdity will not deter Marx-critics, particularly of the milder and revisionist sort, from continually repeating this statement.

This, however, by the way. What does interest us just now is the relation of the third to the first volume, incident to Marx's solution of the "Great Contradiction." Singularly enough, most of the Marx-critics are content with merely stating *ex cathedra* their conclusions or assertions that Marx has, in the third volume, "modified" or "abandoned" the theory stated by him in the first volume, that he contradicts it, that he has adopted a new theory, without giving themselves any particular pains to show the reader just how they arrived at these conclusions, or what is the basis of their assertions, except in the most general way. Always excepting the methodical Böhm-Bawerk, who, besides his general remarks, has also particular objections, separately stated and numbered. We shall pay our respects to them in due time, if there is anything left of them after our general discussion.

Before entering, however, upon the discussion of the theoretical questions involved, we must call attention to the circumstance that the *facts* themselves are not in dispute here, but only their interpretation. Notwithstanding the apparently unanimous verdict of the critics that the Marxian theory is on this point "in direct conflict with reality" and "opposed to the facts," there is really no question here of facts, but merely of their interpretation. The phenomenon itself which, as Marx asserts, brings the Marxian law of value in harmony with the law of equal rate of profit, that is to say: the alleged fact that the products of labor in spheres of production with a higher organic composition of capital are sold at higher prices than the products of labor in spheres with a lower composition of capital, this fact itself, we say, is not disputed by the Marx-critics. It is only as to the explanation of this fact that they differ with Marx. Marx's explanation is based, in the main, on the fact, undisputed by his critics, that the same amount of labor results in a product which will be sold for a higher or lower price according to the higher or lower nature of the organic composition of capital in the sphere in which it was employed. The difference between Marx and his opponents is *as to the reason* for this alleged fact. Marx says the reason is that in the spheres with a higher composition of capital commodities are sold above their value and in spheres with a lower composition of capital below their value; and that the additional value included in the higher price of commodities produced in the first sphere is created in the other sphere and is transferred to their possessor by the very sale of commodities produced in the second sphere below their value. With this reasoning his critics disagree, as they undoubtedly have a right to. But they have no right whatever to hide the circumstance that it is their *reasoning* that is opposed to Marx and not the facts. It is a question of logic and not of fact.

Now, as to the logic of the matter. That there must have been some very poor logic used by somebody can easily be seen from the fact that all Marx-critics who agree that Marx in his "riper" judgment abandoned his theory of value, also agree that even the Marx of the riper judgment never knew that he was propounding in the third volume an old and commonplace theory and was abandoning his own theory on the exposition of which he wasted the entire first and second volumes of his life work.

In what does this abandonment consist according to the Marx-critics? Stripped of their verbiage the statements of these critics amount to this: In the first volume Marx said (1) that the value of a commodity depends on the amount of labor necessary for its (re)production, and that such value was the point

around which its price will oscillate; (2) that the profits of the capitalist, therefore, come from the amount of surplus-value created by *his* workingmen; and (3) that the cost of production had nothing to do with the value or price of a commodity or the profits of the capitalists. In the third volume, on the other hand, he admits that (1) the price of a commodity may be, and usually is, permanently fixed at, or oscillates around, a point which is different from its value as measured by the amount of labor necessary for its (re)production; (2) that the amount of profits which a capitalist obtains from his capital does not depend upon the amount of surplus-value produced by his own workingmen; and (3) that the old theory of cost of production as to value, price and profit holds good.

We will discuss the last proposition first, for the reason that it may throw some light on the whole subject.

Marx says nowhere in the third volume that the cost of production of a commodity determines either its value or its price, except to say that the old values which go into its production in the shape of raw material, etc., are reproduced in it and form part of its value and consequently of its price, a proposition which nobody will claim is an innovation of the third volume. Wherein does the "quite ordinary" theory of cost of production of the third volume then consist? Evidently in the theory of the Price of Production developed in the third volume. But has the price of production anything to do with the cost of production? Have the learned critics not been misled by the similarity of terms? Let us see. What is the "ordinary" theory of cost of production? That the value of a commodity is equal to the cost of its production, plus the average rate of profit on the capital invested in its production. Marx's Price of Production consists of the costs of production (that is, of the *value* of the different ingredients which go into the production) plus the average rate of profit on the capital invested in the production process. The two things look so much alike to the uninitiated that one is not surprised to hear Sombart complain that if that is what we were to come to in the end, wherefore the "cumbrous apparatus" of value and surplus-value?

Let us examine the matter a little closer however. A close examination will show, in the first place, that the Marxian cost of production, which forms a part of the Price of Production, is determined by its value according to the labor theory of value, whereas the "ordinary" theory of cost of production has no such determining element. As a result, the "ordinary" cost of production theory revolves in a vicious circle: The value of a commodity is determined by the cost of its production, the cost of its

production is determined by the value of the commodities which go into its production, the value of these commodities is determined by the cost of *their production*, and so on, and so forth, ad infinitum. In other words, the "ordinary" theory of cost of production can no more explain either the value or the price of commodities than a man can pull himself out of the mire by his own bootstraps.

This is not, however, the principal point. The "cumbrous apparatus" of the Marxian theory of value and surplus-value was necessary in order to attain the principal object of the science of political economy, the discovery of the laws governing the production and distribution of profits in the capitalist system. We have already dwelt on this point at length in a former article. And this "cumbrous apparatus" is still necessary, and is still the only means of attaining this object of political economy, all the Marx-critics to the contrary notwithstanding. Neither the ordinary nor any extra-ordinary theory of cost of production even as much as attempts to solve this problem, which is *the problem* of political economy. The theory of cost of production, which even the "Marxist" Sombart places on a level with the Marxian theory, tells us gravely that the value of a commodity is equal to the cost of its production plus "the average rate of profit." But what is this "average rate of profit"? By what is it determined? Where do profits, whether average or non-average, come from?

In vain will the inquirer look to the theory of cost of production for an answer. But these questions are all answered by the Marxian theory, which our astute critics evidently did not begin to understand. The first volume shows the genesis and general laws of profits; the second volume shows the distribution of profits between the different capitalists, instrumental in the production and distribution of commodities, and the influence of the circulation process on profits; and the third volume shows the reciprocal influences of the different spheres of production and distribution of commodities in the whole capitalist system, and the mode of distribution of all the profits netted to the capitalist class among its different members, *the formation of the average rate of profit*.

By reason of the formation of an average rate of profits, the profit of the individual capitalist does not depend on the amount of surplus-value produced by his own workingmen. This, as we have seen, is the second point on which the third volume is supposed to conflict with the earlier volumes. This objection rests on the grossest misunderstanding of the first and second volumes. Marx never said, and could never have said, that every individual capitalist's profits consist of the surplus-value created by

his own workingmen, or that every capitalist pockets *all* the surplus-value produced by his workingmen. Such a statement would be absolutely repugnant to the spirit of the Marxian doctrine as laid down in the *first* volume. The cardinal difference between the Marxian theory of profits and the theories which preceded it, is that according to Marx all profits of the capitalist class are derived from the process of production. It is with the exhaustive elaboration of this doctrine that the first volume is chiefly concerned, and this is supplemented in the second volume by showing the negative implied thereby, — that no profits are created in the circulation process. But Marx certainly knew that profits *are made* by the capitalists engaged in the circulation process. It was this very knowledge that impelled him to write so exhaustively in order to prove that while these capitalists *derive* their profits from the circulation process, they merely realize during this process, and by means thereof, the profits which are created in the form of surplus values during the process of production.

Of course, this could only happen if some of the capitalists get profits *not created* in the form of surplus-value *by their own workingmen*; nay, notwithstanding the fact that their workingmen created no surplus-value whatever, or that they employed no workingmen at all. This, again, could only happen if the capitalists engaged in the production process did not retain all the surplus-value created by their workingmen, but divided them with the capitalists engaged in the circulation process. It is with the explanation of these facts that the first and second volumes are filled. Yet, some Marx-critics evidently missed even this!

This disposes of the proposition placed by us first because of the prominence given to it by Marx-critics. How could all the surplus-value be produced in the production process of commodities and yet part of it realized in the circulation process, if goods are actually sold at their values? If the value of commodities is the point around which their prices oscillate at all stages of their existence, all the surplus-value contained in them must evidently be realized as soon as they are sold by the producer, and unless some new value attaches to them in the circulation process, the capitalist engaged in that process cannot possibly make any profit. Here was a contradiction greater than any that could result from the supposed law of a common rate of profits, assuming that Marx ever did say that the price of commodities will always oscillate around their value. The "solution" of this "Great Contradiction" is that Marx, as we have repeatedly pointed out, never did say any such thing, and the reading of such a thing into Marx is evidently absurd. A care-

ful reading of the first and second volumes of *Capital* clearly shows that the price of commodities is *governed* by their value, but that it need not conform to it, nor even always oscillate around it. Quite to the contrary. Under given conditions, which are necessary at certain stages of the existence of every commodity, its price will remain constantly away from its value. Always, however, subject to the general laws of value, and by reason of the laws of value. The price formed under these conditions is the Price of Production.

It is generally assumed that the category of the Price of Production is an innovation introduced by Marx in the third volume in an effort to solve the contradiction between the law of value and the law of equal return. This is a mistake. While the term "Price of Production" is first used in the third volume (because there only are all the conditions under which its forms are discussed for the first time) the principle itself is contained in the earlier volumes, and has absolutely nothing to do with the particular problem presented by the question of the equal rate of profits. When Marx came to treat of that problem he simply applied to it a category which already was part of his system as expounded by him in the first and second volumes. The only difference between the category of Price of Production as used in the first and second volumes and as used in the third volume is this: The conditions for the formation of this price discussed in the first two volumes were such as made it always below the value of commodities, whereas the conditions for its formation discussed in the third volume make it possible for the price of production to be either below or above the value of the commodity. But whether above or below value, whether formed by reason of the average rate of profit or under the conditions described in the first and second volumes, or both, the *price of production is governed by the value of the commodity, and exists by reason thereof and in conformity thereto*. In other words, notwithstanding the fact that prices may, in the capitalist system of production and distribution, be permanently at, or oscillate around, a point different from the value of commodities, the *formation* of these prices, and, consequently, *their movement is governed by the laws of value*.

This ought to be plain to all Marx students. But the trouble with Marx-critics, of the economic branch of his theory, as, with those who treat of his historico-philosophic ideas, is, that they cannot distinguish between the individual and social element and cannot see things in their motion. Because the profit of an individual capitalist does not depend merely on the amount of surplus-value produced by his workmen, they conclude that the

theory of surplus-value does not explain the profits which the capitalists get under the capitalist system. And because the price of some commodities may *be* more or less permanently above or below their value, therefore, they assert, the law of value governing the formation and movement of prices in the capitalist system is incorrect. They cannot see that before the capitalist could get his profits at any given *general* rate, that rate must have been established in society according to some law; and that before the price could *be* at a certain point, it had to be *put* there by some social law of value. And they cannot therefore see how the individual and statical cases, while apparently deviating from the general laws in their movement, are actually *governed* by them.

To borrow an example from another science, and an "exact" one at that. The critics of the Marxian law of value are exactly in the same situation as would be the critic of the law of gravity, who would declare that law to be false for the reason that bodies do not fall in actual experience in accordance with the rules formulated by it. Indeed, such a critic would be in a better position than the Marx-critics. For, while according to the laws of gravity falling bodies acquire a velocity of 981 centimeters per second, and that irrespective of their nature, form or size, the "facts of experience" prove conclusively that not one body in a million actually falls at that rate, and any child of some intelligence will tell you that the nature, the form, and the size of a falling object, make all the world the difference in the velocity which it can acquire. Yet, the law of gravity is correct when properly understood. And the Marxian law of value is no less correct. But it requires a greater intelligence than that usually displayed by intelligent children, observers of "facts of experience," and some Marx-critics, to understand it properly. Therein lies the whole trouble.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(*To be continued.*)

A Word of Protest.

IS THERE a movement afoot among the different Socialistic parties of the world, especially of Europe, whereby the smaller nations, their Socialistic parties, are to be deprived of their rights within the International Socialist Movement? Do the Socialists of the stronger nations of Europe, viz. stronger numerically, intend to follow the bourgeois classes of these same nations in their centuries long policy of national oppression? Shall the International Socialist Movement cease to be a movement really international? Shall our International Secretariat be only a representation of states, regardless of nations living within their boundaries? Shall our congresses cease to be gatherings of Socialists of all nations? Shall we witness another disruption of the International?

All these questions, and others, come to our mind when we read the latest news of our movement in Europe. At a conference of the European trade unions, held some time ago in Amsterdam, the delegates of the Bohemian unions, contrary to all precedents, were denied a vote; the organized Bohemian workmen were denied the right of representation, simply because the Bohemian nationality three hundred years ago was deprived of its political independence; for the reason that the Bohemians to-day are compelled to live under the yoke of the Hapsburgs, that their country forms a part of Austria. This is a fact, a grievous fact, but nevertheless a fact. The conference at Amsterdam was a trade union conference, but a great majority of the delegates were Socialists — is their act justifiable? Can fair-minded, unprejudiced Socialists affirm their attitude toward the organized workmen of Bohemia? I think not.

But according to all signs we are to have more of these tactics for whose introduction the German Socialists of Austria are responsible in so large a measure. The decision at Amsterdam, to all appearances and notwithstanding the fact that it was a trade union conference, was only an opening wedge for a new policy in our movement, a policy that spells internal strife and probably the disruption of our international organization.

Here are the facts: Representatives of all the national Socialistic parties are to assemble in Brussels on the twenty-second day of this month.* This conference, among other subjects of importance, is to consider the question of representation of dif-

* This conference has been postponed.—Ed.

ferent nationalities in our International Bureau and of voting at our international congresses.

Comrade Van Kol, of Amsterdam, has introduced a motion the sense of which is that in the International Bureau only such nations shall be represented as have a state form of their own, viz., according to Comrade Van Kol, those Socialistic parties struggling against a common government shall have a common delegation to the Bureau. Van Kol is preparing also another resolution regarding voting at the international congresses; but that is simply a logical result of his first motion. The situation is such that Comrade Van Kol's notions probably will prevail. There are also other signs of changed tactics regarding oppressed nationalities of which I hope to speak later. Hence this article.

Now, what does all this mean? It means, nothing less and nothing more than that the Bohemian, Polish, Finnish, etc. etc., Social-Democratic parties may lose their right of representation in our International Bureau and at Socialistic congresses. If Van Kol's motion prevails, as it probably will, the International Secretariat would recognize only an Austrian Social Democracy. But such a thing in fact does not exist. The Austrian Social Democracy is simply a union of the German Social Democratic Party of Austria, Bohemian Social Democracy, Polish Social Democracy, etc., etc. All these Social Democratic parties have a right to be represented in the Bureau and at all of our congresses. This is a matter of justice and principle. The German Social Democrats, for instance, cannot represent the Bohemian party as they probably would have to in case Van Kol's ideas are carried into effect. All Socialistic parties, regardless of the state they are living in, are entitled to be directly heard in our international conclaves.

The Bohemian Social Democracy will never abandon this fundamental right. With them it is a matter of principle, but also of strength. The Bohemian Social Democrats have relatively the strongest organization in Austria. They, in fact, have launched the present great revolutionary movement in Austria. They had to lash into action their German comrades who of late are displaying such dangerous diplomatic and Chauvinistic tendencies.

The Bohemians have a grand movement in Europe. They are the dominating force in Bohemian politics. But so have the Poles a fine movement. The same can be said of the Finns, and other nations. The Socialistic parties of these nations never can tolerate the injustice contemplated by Comrade Van Kol. They will, I am sure, resist all such encroachments upon their rights.

But, may I ask, since when do the Socialists deprive of the right of representation in their institutions those nations that are

so unfortunate as to live under the yoke of the ruling classes of another nation? Or do some of our comrades believe in such an anomaly as, for instance, an "Austrian nation"? No real Socialist can stand for a thing of that sort.

In view of such dangerous tendencies it is time to call a halt.

I am inclined to think that the Socialists of America ought to do something in this matter. *Caveant consules!* Let us guard the integrity of the International Socialist Movement!

CHARLES PERGLER.

A Socialist Casuistry.

"They eat, and drink, and scheme, and plod,
And go to church on Sunday;
And many are afraid of God,
And more of Mrs. Grundy."

IT IS "more in sorrow than in anger that I take up my pen to point out some of the fallacies of Comrade La Monte's article in the November number of *Wilshire's Magazine* on "Marxism and Ethics," for I realize that it is very hard even for the revolutionary Marxian to rid himself of all his long cherished habits and ideas. With that part of the article which treats of the scientific explanation of ethical standards no scientific socialist can reasonably find fault; but when La Monte attempts to formulate new "criteria" of conduct, he departs from the Marxian groundwork of facts to founder in the swamp of Ideology.

Exhibit A. :—

"The Marxist absolutely denies the freedom of the will. Every human action is inevitable. 'Nothing happens by chance.' Everything is because it can not but be. How then can we consistently praise or blame any conduct? If one cares to make hairsplitting distinctions, it may be replied that we can not, but none the less we can rejoice at some actions and deplore others. And the love of praise, with its obverse, the fear of blame, has ever been one of the strongest motives to human conduct. It is not necessarily the applause of the thoughtless multitude that one seeks; but in writing this paper, which I know will be misunderstood or condemned by the majority of those who read it, undoubtedly one of my motives is to win the approbation of the discerning few for whose good opinion I deeply care.

"The passengers whose train has come to a standstill on a steep up-grade owing to the inefficiency of the engine, will not fail to greet with a hearty cheer the approach of a more powerful locomotive. In the same way, socialist workingmen, though they know, in the words of the wise old Frenchman, that *comprendre tout, c'est pardonner tout*, or, better yet, that to understand all is to understand that there is nothing to pardon, will not be chary of their cheers to him who is able to advance their cause, nor of their curses upon him who betrays it. And in so doing, they will not be inconsistent, but will be acting in strict

accordance with that law of cause and effect which is the very fundament of all proletarian reasoning; for those cheers and curses will be potent factors in causing such conduct as will speed the social revolution."

In the above quotation our casuist admits that we can not consistently praise or blame any conduct, and yet claims that the Socialist workingmen are consistent in praising certain acts and blaming others, as by so doing they will cause "such conduct as will speed the social revolution. ("Hooray for Morgan, and the Trust magnates!") Does not this position remind us of those Freethinkers, who, while admitting that religions are false, condemn the iconoclasts on the grounds that it is religion that saves mankind from crime?

It is unfortunately true that many of us do "curse" those that we think guilty of acts that are detrimental to our interests, and are given to cheering those that are able to advance our cause, but it is not true that those "cheers and curses" are "potent factors" in causing revolutionary conduct. We are all familiar with the Socialist (?) agitator, who, to win the plaudits of his audience (including his "comrades"), gives a sentimental talk on "Justice," the "rights" of the workers, etc., and, on the other hand, every revolutionary agitator on returning to the "select few" who call him comrade after making a clear-cut talk, is greeted with such remarks as, "you shouldn't tell 'em that yet," "Why, you're an *Anarchist*!" and is generally berated for attacking the "most sacred institutions" of — Capitalism.

Cheers and curses, it is true, have their effect on certain individuals in the Socialist movement who lack the courage to stand their ground regardless of what others may think of them, but such weaklings cannot be of much value to the movement, and are more likely to be found amongst those workingmen who are continually "licking the feet" of certain "Intellectuals" or amongst those who, having attained a position of "leadership" in the movement are afraid to risk the dearly loved "cheers" by taking a revolutionary position in times of crises.

"For praise too dearly loved, too warmly sought,

Enfeebles all internal strength of thought."

Goldsmith's lines are good, but he does not state the case with sufficient strength. Those who would be of real use to the Socialist movement must be prepared, when need arises to stand their ground without any regard for the approval or disapproval, not only of the "thoughtless multitude" but even of the "discerning few" for whose good opinion they may deeply care. At this point many will suggest that one who could be so daring, would be influenced by the belief that in some future time his conduct would be duly rewarded with praises or by the hope that his "grand-children would plant flowers on his grave." This

of course might be the motive, but on the other hand there is in itself a sufficient reward.

It was the love of approbation that led Napoleon to a career of bloodshed, and made him the unconscious tool of the Bourgeoisie.

Again, it may be asked, "Can we define as good, those actions which tend to benefit the human race, and as bad those which tend to have a contrary effect? To accept these definitions as a premise from which to judge conduct would lead us to some truly wonderful conclusions. Take for example the sanguinary conduct of Napoleon. The butcheries of this glory loving genius were at the same time cause and effect. The product of a certain historic condition they were necessary to create a favorable environment for the development of the Bourgeoisie, the development of the Bourgeoisie leads us to modern capitalism which in its turn is the necessary precursor of the Co-operative Commonwealth. This bloodshed then was good if we accept the definition suggested above. As a matter of fact all that we can say is that they were necessary. Those who agree with Comrade La Monte have yet another suggestion, "Can we not judge conduct by the motive that inspires it?" To answer this question in the affirmative is to admit that many of the much-censured "Opportunists" are deserving of the highest praise, for it cannot be denied that many of them are perfectly sincere, and though their Opportunism can generally be traced to some particular class interest or influence, they are consciously inspired by a desire to further the interests of humanity. The well-meaning fool is usually regarded as the most exasperating and troublesome type of humanity.

As for personal affection it can scarcely be said to depend upon the approval or disapproval of conduct. Many of those for whose affection I greatly care, are not Socialists, and, for various reasons strongly disapprove of my taking an active part in the movement, nor do they always approve of my personal conduct, or I of theirs, yet, these facts do not affect their affection for me, nor mine for them. On the other hand many of us have no personal affection for some of those who are with us in thought and action as far as the movement is concerned, and whose personal conduct is irreproachable when judged by conventional standards or by our own. These vagaries (?) of personal feeling can of course be explained, but it is sufficient for our present purpose merely to recognize them.

Comrade La Monte would also have us adopt a Neo-Comstockian method of Dramatic Criticism.

Exhibit B. :—

"But those of us who call Sudermann the first of living

dramatists, do so on account of the extreme nobility of his heroines' conduct judged by the criteria of the future."

So? Artistic standards of taste are to disappear and dramatists must submit to the dictates of a revolutionary Mrs. Grundy. The much lamented "commercialism" in its worst phase could not have a more disastrous effect upon the Dramatic art. For my part I shall continue to judge a Drama as a Drama, a novel as a novel, a poem as a poem, without regard to the conduct of heroes or heroines. Such, I believe, is the usual method of judging an artist's work. The fact that Bernard Shaw in some of his plays gives expression to views of Bourgeois morality in which I acquiesce, does not blind me to the fact that he is, in my opinion, a very indifferent dramatist, judging his work from an artistic standpoint, nor does the fact that Bernard Shaw is, in my opinion, a blackguard, prevent me from rejoicing at his attacks on conventional morality; but I neither blame him for being a blackguard and an indifferent dramatist, nor praise him for attacking the Bourgeoisie. I recognize the facts and prefer to say, with the old Roman playwright Terence, "Man am I, nothing that is human do I count foreign to myself." (The "intellectuals" will pardon me for writing in one language at a time.)

"I have said enough to show that for a Marxian to praise or blame is ridiculous, that so far as the love of approbation is concerned it is as likely to cause deplorable conduct as not, but I must crave the indulgence of my readers while I examine some further fallacies of La Monte's "Criteria."

Exhibit C. :—

"It is because I believe that this love of one's fellows under Socialism will be a joy far exceeding in intensity any pleasure known to us, that I look for dramatic art to reach under Socialism a perfection and influence to-day inconceivable."

I, too, think that the love of one's fellows under Socialism will be a joy far exceeding in intensity any pleasure known to us, and also that the dramatic art, in fact all art, will reach a perfection and influence hitherto unknown and inconceivable. But the love of one's fellows will not, as La Monte would seem to think, be the chief cause of the development of art. Love of one's fellows will of course aid this development, but a greater cause must be sought in the increased opportunities that will be afforded the artists, and most of all in the fact that they will no longer be compelled (as they are to-day for economic reasons) to consider the wishes of others and will consequently be able to put their best effort into their work and will work solely for the joy of artistic creation. As Paul La Fargue has so happily expressed it :—

"The artist then will paint, will sing, will dance, the writer

will write, the musician will compose operas, the philosophers will build systems, the chemist will analyze substances not to gain money, to receive a salary, not to deserve applause, but to win laurel wreaths, like the conquerors at Olympic games, but to satisfy their artistic and scientific passions; one does not drink a glass of champagne or kiss the woman he loves for the benefit of the gallery."

That La Fargue has the facts of the case can not be denied, for even to-day those artists and scientists who are most worthy of the name, pay absolutely no heed to the opinions of the Comstockian public.

How, then is the individual to regulate his conduct? The only answer to this question based on the facts is: by striving always to be true to his or her individuality, i. e., to seek the greatest possible pleasure and to avoid pain. It is true that those who so regulate their conduct will be likely to make mistakes, and by this I mean that they will sometimes be guilty (?) of conduct that will cause both themselves and their fellows pain. But this is far more true of those whose conduct is regulated by other methods. While it can not be denied that the love of approbation has ever been and yet is one of the strongest motives to human action, the idea that it always will be can only be evolved from the brain of an "Intellectual" trying to console himself for his coming political downfall with the hope of retaining his supposed academic superiority. For is it not reasonable to suppose that under Socialism the fact that every human act is inevitable will be even more generally known than the law of gravitation is to-day? Knowing that nothing "happens by chance" men will know that no human act is deserving of praise or blame, and an examination of the facts will show that the effect of praise or blame on human character is more likely to be pernicious and weakening than salutary and strengthening and therefore they will neither praise nor blame individuals for their conduct. Scientists recognize facts and facts alone. The facts, it must be admitted, give no ground on which to praise or blame conduct. "To do thy will, enjoy sweet life," will no longer be "vice." It is well for the liberati of the Socialist movement to bear in mind the advice of Carlyle to Tom Taylor, "Just say what you think, but first find out just what you do think, if that be practicable," and above all things they should stick to the facts.

WALLIS ROBERTS.

Wichita, Kansas.

* "Socialism and the Intellectuals," by Paul La Fargue.

EDITORIAL

Socialists and Government Ownership.

With the approaching municipal campaigns nearly every socialist local in the country is busy discussing the attitude to be taken toward the wave of municipalization and nationalization that is just now sweeping over the country. To a large extent this problem is peculiarly American. The socialist parties of all other countries have always been friendly toward such movements and all contain demands for municipalization in their platform. To be sure this is always done without in any way claiming these as essential parts of socialism. In the United States, however, there are some socialists who have declared their bitter hostility to all efforts to extend the functions of nation, state or municipality, while these remain in the hands of capitalist parties. They have made this attitude a test of orthodoxy. No matter what a person's belief may be in other directions, if he favors municipal ownership of street cars he is a traitor to socialism. He may accept a national platform like that of the Socialist Labor party containing all the platitudes of middle class philosophy from "natural rights" to a "purpose" in government and still be an orthodox Marxian socialist, but if he insinuates that government ownership of railroads might not be a crime against the working class he becomes a "middle class muddle head" at once.

To be sure this position is not quite so ridiculous as this bare statement indicates. There is a modicum of method in the madness. This is the only country in which these questions have been made the political creed of a radical middle class movement.

In England and Germany states and cities have taken over industries purely for military or administrative purposes. In many cases these steps were taken by conservative parties. The Russian autocracy has gone as far as any country in the world in the extension of governmental functions. In England the ownership of docks and the municipalization of industries often finds strong support from the old landed aristocracy. In this country on the contrary this movement has always been attached to radicalism and has been generally urged as a step toward socialism.

It has become one phase of the small capitalist revolt which is filling our magazines with the "literature of exposure."

This class of small exploiters see in municipalization and nationalization a hope of curbing the power of the great capitalist class and thereby gaining for themselves a momentary foothold on the backs of the workers. La Follette, Dunne, Hearst, and numerous politicians are seeking to ride into power upon this sentiment. There is no doubt whatever about the fact that this movement is going to play a great part in American politics during the next four or five years. As a consequence there seems to be a sort of stampede among the socialists in two directions. One faction demands that we climb into the band wagon or rather that we insist upon our right to lead the procession; the other would have us confine our efforts to throwing bricks at the participants as they pass by.

Perhaps if we pause long enough to consider what are the actual functions of the Socialist party we shall be better able to solve this problem. From the very beginning and in all countries it has been thoroughly recognized that the first and foremost fundamental purpose of the whole socialist movement is the organization of the working class into a compact revolutionary body ready to conquer the position of social rulership. All else must give way to this purpose. Every platform, method of organization, question of tactics must meet this test: "Will it further or retard the solidarity of a class conscious revolutionary proletariat?" No momentary gain, no reform, no "first step" is of sufficient importance to justify such a use of the party organization as will sow the seeds of disintegration, relax the bond of coherence, or obscure its revolutionary attitude.

These reasons must always prevent any use of the party as such for the attainment of municipal ownership, initiative and referendum, etc., whenever such use will involve the advocacy of such measures to such an extent as to bring into the organization members not fully in accord with the main purpose of the party, or which shall tend to confuse that purpose in the minds of those who are already members. We can never afford, for instance, to "make a campaign" on the question of municipal ownership. Our educational work and propaganda must never be permitted to center around anything less than the complete conquest of public power by the socialists. It must be remembered that even collectivism is after all but a method of using proletarian power when once gained. Whether every tool and every instrument of production shall be socialized or not is a question on which there may well be differences of opinion, and which can only be settled when the workers are in power and by the workers of that time. But there never can be any question for socialists as to whether the working class or capitalist class ought to rule in society. To suggest that the socialist party desires to serve any other class even momentarily is treason to the principle of socialism. Since, so long as the class struggle exists any such interests must be antagonistic to the working class cause and therefore any attempt to

further they will have the age old result of every attempt to serve two masters.

There is a need in the socialist movement to-day of a revival, not of the phrases of the old class conscious revolutionary socialism, but of a knowledge of what those phrases mean. The phrases have been worn out and very frequently by those who knew little of their need.

Our present party organization shows some dangers of falling into the hands of non-working-class members. We would be the last to raise any test of occupation within the membership of the socialist party and have always denounced all such attempts in the past. Nevertheless we can not but feel that those positions which have anything to do with determining policy and tactics should so far as possible be filled with men who have not lost touch with the actual class struggle of shop and factory.

There will always be a pendulum-like swing from one side to the other in any rapidly growing movement. There is no need to grow frightened because of these movements, because the class struggle is the one great fact around which a socialist movement must center just as according to Marxian economics the amount of labor crystallized in any article constitutes the norm around which the market price must always vary. But it is easily possible that at times this variation from the class struggle point of view may become so great that it will require so violent a movement to bring the party activity back to its proper position as to partially disrupt our organization. For these reasons continuous watchfulness is essential. Eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty, it is also the only requisite of constant progress.

SOCIALISM . ABROAD

ENGLAND.

For the moment the center of socialist interest has been transferred to the British Isles. England, at once the classic land of capitalism, and also the classic land from which to draw illustrations by the enemies of socialism of the slowness of revolutionary thought to develop, has at last shown signs of redemption. In spite of the proverbial cleverness of the English rulers, which never found a better illustration than when a dissolution of Parliament was preceded by the formation of a Liberal cabinet, containing that traitor to the working class, John Burns, as one of its members, and with a program promising relief to the unemployed and abolition of convict labor on the Rand,—yet in spite of these clever tactics, the result showed that a portion at least of the working class of England could be fooled no longer. The complete returns of the election shows nearly fifty labor members elected. The following is a partial list of these members and the organizations to which they belong:

Social Democratic Federation—Will Thorne.

Independent Labor Party—J. Keir Hardie, George Barnes, Philip Snowden, J. R. MacDonald, J. R. Clynes, J. Parker, H. H. Jowett.

Independent Socialists—George Lansbury.

Labor Representation Committee—G. D. Kelley, A. H. Gill, J. J. Jenkins, J. O'Grady, G. H. Roberts, J. T. MacPherson, T. F. Richards, Will Crooks, Charles Duncan, T. Glover, G. J. Wardle, W. Hudson, Alex. Wilkie, S. Walsh, C. W. Bowerman.

A few words of explanation as to the character of working class organization in England are necessary to an understanding of the present situation. Three bodies were represented in the election. The first is the Social Democratic Federation, the oldest socialist body in England, based upon the Marxian doctrines, and in general standing upon practically the same lines as the Socialist Party of the United States. Besides this the Independent Labor Party is also an avowed socialist body largely opportunist in its outlook. The Independent Labor Party in connection with the Trades Unions and some minor socialist organizations constitutes the Labor Representation Committee. This body has no platform and only requires as condition of endorsement that the candidate shall pledge himself to become a member of an independent "labor group" in the house of Commons independent from the Liberal and Conservative Parties. Many of the men so elected are sympathetic with the socialist movement, other are almost antagonistic. The S. D. F. was originally a member of the L. R. C., but withdrew when that body refused to accept the class struggle as a principle of action. There is one phase of the election which especially deserves comment. Comrade H. M. Hyndman, by

far the foremost socialist in the English speaking world to-day, stood for Burnley. From the beginning he stood on a clear cut socialist platform. He received no endorsement from any "labor" body whatever. He had the honor of being the most fiercely fought man in the whole British Kingdom. Not only did he have the regular Conservative and Liberal opponents, but when it became evident that these could not be elected the country was ransacked to find a labor leader so lost to all sense of decency as to permit himself to be used as an opponent. This man was found in one F. Maddison, who was finally elected by a vote of 5,288 to Comrade Hyndman's 4,932 votes, the Conservative candidate polling 4,964. It is significant that when in 1895 Comrade Hyndman ran in the same district he only received 1,498 votes. It is not an exaggeration to say that more forces of capitalism were probably concentrated against him than were ever brought together against one man before. These included not only the Liberal and Conservative and renegade labor forces already described, but the Salvation Army and the Catholic Church, who joined hands in this battle, to say nothing of the introduction of the direct use of bribery something not common in English elections.

MEXICO.

From our correspondent in Mexico, who for reasons already explained in these columns dares not permit his name to be known, we learn that once more the fire of socialism is being kindled in that country. He writes that "practically no socialist literature has ever fallen into the hands of the working class of Mexico and consequently they know little or nothing about the doings of working class political parties in other countries. But the conditions of life that make Socialists are here in great abundance. In short, where Capitalism is, Socialism *will be*. Less than a year ago a socialist spark became visible in this city, (Guadalajara) as if from spontaneous combustion. A few minds had shaken off the thralldom of religious fanaticism and had discovered the beautiful theories of socialism. A small paper began to be published, "El Obrero Socialista," under the direction of Senor Roman Morales, assisted by a small but resolute group of comrades. Later they organized "Liga Socialista de Guadalajara" which holds regular weekly meetings. Yesterday being the first anniversary of "Red Sunday" in Russia, this league held a special meeting last night to commemorate the event. There was music and speeches. The hall was decorated with the national colors of Mexico and red flags. On the walls were shields bearing the names and nationality of some of the world's most prominent socialists and friends of labor; among which I recall "Father" Gapon, Maxim Gorki, Karl Marx, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Enrico Ferri, Frederick Engels, Jean Jaures, Emile Vandervelde, Tom Mann, Pablo Iglesias, Ella Wheeler Wilcox, and "Mother" Jones. The meeting was the first *public* socialist gathering ever held in this Republic. It passed off without police interference and was a success in every way. The spark has become a flame and I believe that no power will be able to prevent the formation of a national socialist political party in this country in the near future. The Mexican proletariat is beginning to realize the sublime idea of international working class solidarity."

RUSSIA.

The news columns of the capitalist press of America would have us believe that the Russian revolution was over with and that the workers were crushed. Their financial columns, however, belie this story with their continuous tale of the downward course of the Russian bonds. The

European papers also recognize that the revolution has really only begun and that Moscow was but one of the first battles. The returning soldiers from Siberia are bringing back new recruits for the revolutionary movement. The Caucasus district is practically in the hands of the revolutionists, while the crushing out of the Moscow revolution is still occupying 30,000 troupes,—quite a respectable army to be used in quelling what we are assured is already dead. This army is carrying out a campaign of murder and rapine of the most hideous character. Stories of the killing of whole bodies of troupes, the shooting down of women and children are continually leaking through. At the same time the revolutionists have taken up terrorist tactics and official after official is falling a victim to the individual warfare.

SPAIN.

The recent legislative elections in Spain showed a falling off in the socialist vote, which was 26,000 in 1903, to 15,000. The socialists, however, state that this is in no way an indication of a decline of socialist strength, but is due to various causes wholly apart from the growth of socialism. Among these is the fact that many agricultural workers were prevented by force from casting their votes and that the terrible industrial crisis has created great armies of unemployed who have either emigrated, wandered about the country until they have lost the right to vote, or were herded in despairing mobs in the cities too weak and dispirited to even take an interest in their own emancipation.

SWITZERLAND.

According to a review of the Swiss socialist movement, which appears in the Berlin *Vorwärts*, the past year has been one of steady rapid growth. Owing to the unfair method of districting, however, the socialist party with 100,000 votes only succeeded in electing 38 representatives, while the radical party with twice as many votes has 103 representatives. One of the most active features of the campaign of the recent year has been in opposition to the use of the militia against strikers, something that it might be well for those who are advocating the Swiss system in this country to observe. There have been an extraordinarily large number of strikes during the past year and the industrial movement is growing rapidly.

FRANCE.

For the first time in the history of France two socialist senators have been elected. Owing to the indirect method of election and the property qualifications the socialists have hitherto found it impossible to enter the senate. Even those who were elected are of the opportunist wing and secured their place only through compromise with the radical party.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

In discussing trade union conditions with Secretary Frank Morrison, of the A. F. of L., a few weeks ago, the latter declared that the movement had been practically at a standstill during the past two years, but thought that this year progress will become marked through a general revival. A day or two following Thomas I. Kidd, formerly a vice-president of the Federation, dropped in and the labor situation was again from the organization standpoint. "Our union (the woodworkers) lost ground," said Mr. Kidd, "along with many others. The butchers, iron and steel workers, garment workers, hotel and restaurant employes and quite a few others have had considerable of a decrease in membership. But we will have to make the best of it and renew our efforts to strengthen our lines." The next day a general organizer of an international union blew in and said: "I am unable to account for the lethargy among the rank and file of workers. I just came up through the South and the conditions are anything but satisfactory. Many of our locals in that section have gone to pieces, and it looks as though we have not yet reached rock bottom. The demands of Southern union officials for more general organizers are perfectly justified and I understand that President Gompers will visit that section in person and look over the ground. But it will require more than his magic presence to reorganize the workers down there." The labor papers also speak in discouraging tones, and reports of state bureaus of labor, state federations and city central bodies all indicate that the slump during recent months has been real and is by no means at an end. It is a fact that there is no apparent reason for the decrease in membership that seems to be general when comparisons are made with former years of industrial activity. Work has been fairly plentiful in all the trades and wages have remained stationary. At least there have been no general reductions, and in some crafts there were slight advances. At the Pittsburg Federation convention I questioned some of the national officers regarding this matter, and, as a rule, they frankly admitted that they were unable to account for the depression. Not even the Socialists were held responsible for the existing lethargy by those delegates who were in daily touch with the rank and file. On the contrary, one of the national officers of the miners surprised me by declaring that if it were not for the constant agitation of the Socialists among them their organization would not be in as good shape as it is at present. This same official also made the astonishing statement that the majority of the national executive board of the United Mine Workers are Socialists or lean strongly toward that side of the fence, and backed up this information by preparing a list of the board members and giving their political preferences as he understood them. Now while Gompers and his ultra-conservative followers have at-

tacked the Socialists at every opportunity, and have duly noted and not infrequently also magnified every little local 'scrap' in which the red button fellows may have been mixed, it is true, and they know it, that generally the country over, in large cities and small towns, the Socialists in the trade unions have been and are now the most active and aggressive workers for organization, irrespective as to whether or not they are in the minority and are compelled to dodge the blacklist whip of the capitalists and receive the sneers of the Gompersites for their pains. The thing that is ailing the American trade union movement is the fossilized policy of its officialdom that leads nowhere. In every civilized country in the world organized labor seems to have some goal, some ideal, to struggle toward—everywhere but in America. Here we have the petrified sameness, like boarding house hash, over and over again, and then some more. Gompers and his crowd were quick to claim the credit for the rapid growth of the unions a few years ago; now let them bear the odium of retrogression. The fact is, beginning with the new century, the unions grew in membership and power because of economic pressure and in spite of Gompers and his reactionary ideas. Gompers had no more to do with forming new unions in Chicago, New York, Cleveland or any other place than the child unborn. He knew nothing about them until reports were sent in from international officials, who also, as a rule, had little or nothing to do with organized local unions except to attach their John Hancocks and the official seal to the charter. In most instances the unions were formed by obscure local organizers who are attached to city central bodies, who work at their trades all day and then spend their evenings in attempting to improve the conditions of their fellowmen. These voluntary organizers are the backbone of the American labor movement. While they do the practical work Gompers poses and squints sideways for bouquets and boasts of the success of the movement under his administration. If a strike is won, he announces loudly all about what "we" have done. If a strike is lost, Sam forgets about it. Just for illustration: President Gompers was reported as preparing to go South and rally the labor hosts about the A. F. of L. standard. He will do nothing of the sort. Mr. Gompers wrote a prominent union official in Atlanta, under date of December 30, that he regrets more than words can express that it is absolutely impossible for him to make his organizing and lecturing trip through the South. Why? Because the International Typographical Union was engaged in the eight-hour struggle. "Of course," says he, "it is true that I am not in charge of the strike," says he, "but," says he, "you can readily appreciate how intensely interested I am in it and for its successful consummation," says he, and a lot more along the same line. Mr. Gompers surely takes himself seriously. He has had less to do with the strike than the most obscure printer in Alaska. But it was a golden opportunity to get near the centre of the stage, and watch him at Minneapolis! Lynch, Bramwood and the I. T. U. officers who directed the fight from beginning to end, and who sweat blood while the suave Samuel puffed cigars and looked wise, will be completely eclipsed. It was this unseemly haste to push himself to the fore and claim all the credit that was lying around loose that disgusted the miners three years ago and started them on a still hunt looking for his scalp, and if Duncan, first vice-president, had not displayed a yellow streak at the critical moment the latter would have been advanced to the presidency.

The truth of the matter is Gompers can arouse no enthusiasm among the rank and file. As a rule, his mass meetings are a failure, not because the workers feel any personal ill will toward our worthy president, for as an individual Sam is a fine old fellow, but for the reason that he bears no message, offers no program, speaks platitudinously, and lets

it go at that. The radicals, who are always the life of a community, are not attracted and the slow poke conservatives are indifferent. The revolution of labor-saving machinery, the centralization of capital and modern business methods, and all the daily developments in social, economic and political life teach Gompers nothing. The action of the workers in every civilized country in the world in marshaling their forces at the ballot-box as class-conscious armies to capture the powers of government and change them from instruments of exploitation and oppression into means of establishing liberty and justice is meaningless to Gompers who seems to be equally at home at fraternizing and momentarily shining at the festal board of the civic Federation or down on his knees before corrupt politicians begging for labor laws that are not forthcoming.

It should not be understood that Gompers is all-powerful in the Federation. I have said before, and repeat it now, that if his election were submitted to referendum vote he would be defeated with ease. Gompers' strength consists in being surrounded by a fairly strong ring of national officers who are no more progressive than he; in the inability of the opposition to centralize on some candidate who could defeat him, and, finally, in the undesirability of influential men to accept the presidency of the A. F. of L., which carries no power with it, and they would hesitate to make the huge bluffs that Gompers does to keep themselves in the public eye. Yet the position, from the standpoint of moral influence, could be made an important one through the inauguration of a campaign of education that would assist materially in starting the masses moving forward. It has been stated, and in a sense truly, that the rank and file are responsible for Gompers and that he reflects their views. But the union membership is no more responsible for Gompers than the voters of New York are for Senator Depew, and there are those among us who deny that he expresses the hopes and aspirations of the great working class of this country. He is a leader along a straight and narrow path who leans backward and holds in check those behind, and takes no progressive step unless he is pushed along. And so by mere sentiment, with little or no actual power, like the governor of a state who has no veto power, Gompers is doing his utmost to enervate the labor movement. Dissatisfaction is heard on every hand; good men are dropping out of the ranks because no progress is being made, and it is becoming a serious problem to keep the active workers in the field. "Organize," they say, "yes; but then what? Strike and boycott against the constantly growing power of capitalism—pit our stomachs against bags of money? Some new and better way must be devised." But after the Pittsburg farce there is little likelihood that the A. F. of L. as conducted at present, will take the initiative to popularize any new idea. Had the capmakers' resolution been adopted and a commission been appointed to investigate the desirability of taking political action, in time we might have gotten as far as the British trade unionists are, whom we pretend to imitate. But not even that small crumb of comfort was conceded to the radicals. Fact is, political thought and discussion, except of the begging sort, was tabooed, for the present at least. It is to be hoped that at the Minneapolis convention next November the sweet dreams of the fossilized element will not be disturbed by any thought of rantankerous invasion from Socialists. Just what any Socialist can want at the next reunion of ultra-conservative "labor leaders" who are ambitious to gain the approving smiles of the capitalistic powers that be is problematical. The thing to do is to permit the reactionists of every stripe to have full swing, and there is no law that I know of to prevent the progressive elements, those who favor political action, from holding an informal conference at some convenient

point some time during the year and deciding upon a live action to improve the trade union movement. No individual or set of individuals own the trade unions—at least not yet.

During the past two years it has been hinted from time to time that the Parry-Post union-smashers were elaborating a scheme to organize a standing army of strike-breakers to be utilized whenever and wherever necessity demanded it. The plan included securing control of men and women in every trade and paying them a bonus over and above the wage rates for which the unions were struggling in a contest between labor and capital. During normal conditions the scabs are to be provided with employment at prevailing rates of wages, or if there are no jobs they are to be kept on the pay roll just the same. Pension schemes, vacations, etc., have been suggested as bait, calculated to attract and hold the unwary and ignorant workers or those among them who have no conscience and can be purchased for the usual thirty pieces of silver. It is now given out that the plan has matured quite fully, and that preparations have been made by the union-smashing capitalists to meet the possible attacks of organized labor at every important industrial point in the United States. Employment bureaus have been established in every large city, with a central office in New York, and the Parryites claim that they have fully 180,000 idle men registered in the various bureaus who are ready to go anywhere to work. Only a picked few among this army will be carried on the pay roll. The others are expected to remain loyal to their masters by the promises of good situations when trouble comes. Whether this plan will work out as its promoters expect remains to be seen. "The schemes of mice and men gang aft a'glee."

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHANGING ORDER, A STUDY OF DEMOCRACY, by Oscar Lovell Triggs. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 300 pages, \$1.00.

The central thought of this book is summed up in the statement that "philosophical monism, social democracy, characteristic art, and the corresponding aesthetics are parts of one stupendous social movement." In developing this thesis, the author shows how each and every form of art has grown out of the industrial conditions amid which it lived and has stood in close relation to the entire social life of its age. The perfection of form of the Greeks, the romantic mysticism of the middle ages, the scientific trend of capitalism and finally the democracy springing from the growing revolutionary movement of the workers each have wrought corresponding changes in art, literature and music. To-day, in response to the democratic tendency, art and industry are being united in the play idea, with the possibility of its application to every day life through the beautifying of all production.

The four chapters on "The Philosophy of Play," "Democratic Education," "The Work Shop and School," and "A School of Industrial Art" make one of the most valuable discussions of the new philosophy of education that has yet appeared. Here it is shown how by the application of the "play principle" education may be made attractive, interesting, and in combination with industrial training, with universal application, be made democratic and suited to a new society. The whole book is permeated with the philosophy of Whitman and Morris. Its reading by a man of artistic training should be sufficient to make him a socialist. At one place the author expresses a disbelief in the efficacy of political action by the laborers, adopting a somewhat anarchistic position, but he does this only in a suggestive manner without argument and we believe that further investigation would satisfy him that the workers can by no means afford to neglect the ballot as a means of attaining the ends set forth in the book, and indeed that it is one of the most effective means to that end. Aside from that the work is on the whole in accord with the principles of the international socialist movement.

The author does not stop with the purely theoretical side of this subject. He goes on to show how the "sociological view point in art can be practically applied in education by the union of the work shop and the school, permeated with the play idea." Tolstoi and William Morris are studies as showing phases of the evolution of the new idea, and the work closes with a chapter on "The Outlook to the East" pointing out the influence of Oriental art and life and its relation to present day problems.

The book is an extremely valuable addition to the literature of socialism, whose reading will give a new and wider view-point to the average socialist worker.

BETTER-WORLD PHILOSOPHY, A SOCIOLOGICAL SYNTHESIS, by J. Howard Moore. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 275 pages, \$1.00.

The author of this book is the instructor in zoology in the Crane Manual Training High School, Chicago, and approaches his problem from the point of view of biological monism. He studies man as a "being of desires," traces the process by which he has conquered his environment, first in the tooth and claw struggle as an animal and then later with all the marvelous tools which distinguish him from the rest of the animate universe. Slowly man has come to realize that the universe is controlled by law and that there are no accidents or causeless happenings. "The ideal relation of the inhabitants of the universe to each other is that relation which will aid most actively in the satisfaction of the desires of the universe." Bearing that principle in mind, he then proceeds to discuss the possibility of attaining this ideal, with the various problems which arise in connection with man's relation to his inanimate environment and to mankind. His chapter on "Race Culture" is especially suggestive to those who have become impressed with the ideas circulated in the conventional world and clustering around the concept of race suicide. He shows how by the application of biological principles of selection through alteration of the environment any sort of race desired can be produced. Those who are cast out by present society may or may not be the fittest to survive in the sense of being the most desirable for race purposes:

"A very large percentage of criminals are the victims of industrial conditions. They were driven to their deeds by economic impalement. Unable to conquer a livelihood on account of the preempted condition of opportunities and the finiteness of their own powers, they chose violence as a last horrible resort. If they had not been endowed with an instinct to live, they might have lain down peacefully and passed away, if they could have found some monopolist gracious enough to allow to them six feet of his dominions as a ceasing-couch. But being, like other sons of mortals, too fastidious to rot, they did the only thing possible to avoid it. When men, capable and eager, traverse the land in sad-eyed armies, season after season, seeking opportunity to earn honest nutrition, and seeking in vain for even the ravellings of existence, the marvel is, that they are so patient—the marvel is, that they do not in an epileptic of despair leap at the throat of society, and exact from its rich jugulars that which the simplest justice adjudicates to them."

The work is written in a delightfully clear and simple style which makes it a strikingly agreeable contrast to most works dealing with this subject matter.

THE GREATEST TRUST IN THE WORLD, by Charles Edward Russell. The Ridgeway Thayer Co. Cloth, 252 pages, \$1.50.

This is a contribution to the great "literature of exposure" so characteristic of the present. It is a strongly written discussion of the beef trust with its private cars, stockyards, distributing stations and general control over this portion of the food of the world. "Here is something compared with which the Standard Oil is puerile; here is something that affects a thousand lives where the Standard Oil affects one; here is something that promises greater fortunes and greater power than the Standard Oil Companies." The Beef Trust has by means of its refrigerator car system and its tremendous capital been able to dominate, not simply the meat business, but all industries concerned with perishable commodities. The tribute levied upon the fruit and vegetable trade stops only at the point where these commodities would no longer reach the mar-

ket. Other business has been swept aside with the ruthlessness which has always marked commercial warfare until there is a long row of "notches on the trust's knife-handle." It has used state and national governments whenever they were needed, almost as handily as it has manipulated its packing-houses. All this is told with a strong, almost sensational style, the dramatic points well developed so as to make a good "story" in the journalistic sense. On the whole it is written from the stand-point of the small capitalist and professional man. There is nothing concerning the condition of the laborers who do the work, no word of the effect of concentration in fixing wages. The chapter on "Possible Cures for a Huge Evil" is almost silly, the whole discussion culminating in its demand for legislation against rebates. As if the same financial powers were not controlling railroads and beef-trust alike, and government to boot.

THE END OF THE WORLD, by Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Margaret Wagner, Chas. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago.

"We seem to exist in a hazardous time,
 Driftin' along here through space;
 Nobody knows just when we begun
 Or how fur we've gone in the race.
 Scientists argy we're shot from the sun,
 While others we're going right back;
 An' some say we've allers been here more or less,
 An' seem to establish the fact
 O' course 'at's' somepin' 'at nobody knows,
 As far as I've read or cun see;
 An' them as does know all about the hull scheme,
 Why, none of 'em never agree."

These homely but genial verses of Ben King were suggested to me by Dr. Meyer's interesting essay entitled *The End of the World*. It is not that there is anything flippant or superficial in the author's treatment of his subject but there is a contagious cheerfulness about his manner of reviewing the possibilities of sudden or slow world dissolution which almost provokes a smile. It is curious to observe the effect produced by the same data upon men of differing temperaments. Mr. W. H. Mallock contemplates the extinction of the human race and becomes a profound pessimist. Dr. Meyer views the entire panorama of ceaseless change throughout the universe and finds in it only a confirmation of his optimism. Nature, according to him, destroys only to upbuild in grander style. This seems to me to be a far reaching conclusion not justified by our present imperfect knowledge of cosmic phenomena. Is it not more true to the facts in the case to conceive of the cosmos as in a state of constant equilibrium in which the forces that make for evolution and dissolution balance each other? Still, for us, it remains also true that our planet has not passed beyond the stage of earliest youth. Our author suggests this and the further probability that millions of years must pass before "the terrible coldness of icy space well enwrap the earth." The book is a study of cosmic decay in which familiar facts are presented in a style certain to prove attractive to the average reader interested in such themes.

LILIAN HELLER UDELL.

THE MENACE OF PRIVILEGE, by Henry George, Jr. Macmillan Co., New York. 421 pages \$1.50.

The single tax philosophy has taken a decidedly different turn within the last decade. When Henry George, Sr., wrote he said very little about "privilege" and very much about single tax. Now the emphasis is all

the other way and the single taxer sees "privilege" everywhere. He does not have the honesty, however, to admit that he is thereby recognizing what the socialists pointed out a half a century ago, that privilege is simply another name for the advantage which a ruling class obtains by reason of the fact that it has possession of the government and is in no way a peculiarity of landed property. The present work has summarized a great mass of information concerning the present capitalist class, their style of living, morality, etc., upon the one hand and of the general degradation of the working class upon the other. In the portion devoted to the weapons of privilege he has some very suggestive facts on control of the courts and government by capitalism but has to drag in his jargon about "privilege" in a way that vitiates the entire matter.

When we come to examine the theoretical and remedial portion, it is hard to avoid ridicule. Starting out with an intuitive philosophy and the idea of permanence in social laws perhaps he should not be expected to have any historical sense. We find the age of Washington and Franklin described as a sort of golden age in which "real poverty was casual and no where deep or chronic." It seems hard to believe that a man could be so palpably ignorant of American history as not to know that American labor probably reached its lowest depths in the years immediately following the revolutionary war.

A slight reference to McMaster or to Matthew Carey's "Olive Branch" or "Report on Philadelphia Charity," or "The Crisis" would have shown him that during the crisis of 1819 the unemployed, the beggar, and the soup house were familiar.

We have the same senseless chatter about "nature" that has persisted since the days of Rousseau among pseudo-sociologists, the fallaciousness of which has probably been exposed a thousand times during the last century. It is hard to believe that we are in the 20th century when we read such stuff as this: "The Principles of Political Economy do not rest upon human worth or human inactment. Nor do they change. They are based on laws of nature, which are eternal." Shades of Bastiat and Rousseau, Physiocrats and Mercantilists, arise from your forgotten tombs of a century ago to greet your resurrected and long exploded dogmas, now presented as the latest thing in radical literature.

NEW CREATIONS IN PLANT LIFE, by W. S. Harwood, *The MacMillan Co.* Cloth, 386 pp.

The work of Luther Burbank is perhaps more prophetic of what may be accomplished when intelligence is applied to production, especially in the fields of invention and innovation in general, than that of any other man of this century. He has shown the plasticity of plant forms in the hands of man to a degree that seems little less than magical. He has not simply "made two blades of grass grow where there was but one before;" he has brought entirely new species of grass and plants of all kind into the world. He has multiplied the productive power of some plants, created others especially adapted to conditions hitherto hostile to plant life; he has doubled and trebled the size of some flowers and put new perfumes into others. The most striking of his recent accomplishments has been the production of the "Thornless Edible Cactus." This plant, which furnishes immense quantities of food for both men and cattle or horses, at once makes inhabitable great stretches of arid territory hitherto incapable of supporting animal life. He has evolved a tree that produces nuts within eighteen months after planting, and another that grows several times as fast as any hitherto known, thus solving the problem of timber, and, indeed, making it possible to raise timber by forestry methods which, because of its better character, ease of cutting, etc., can be produced much

cheaper than the primitive forests could be cut. These things should mean the final sod above the grave of already long dead Malthusianism. All this has been done within the life-time of a single man. It has not been done by any marvelous peculiar personal power, but simply by patience and skill and a highly developed power of observation. It requires a long period to produce results, and hence is ill suited to capitalist methods of business, but could best be carried on by governmental departments where the coming and going of individuals would not affect the progress of the work. Mr. Burbank, himself, says on this point: "There is work enough to be done in this line for the government to put at work a thousand experts, and the possibilities ahead of them are so great that the whole face of nature might be changed by them by an intelligent, patient and systematic following of breeding and selection." He is here referring to the possibilities in forestry alone, and the opportunities in many other fields are even greater. The book is one of intense interest and remarkably suggestive. This is because of the value of the matter treated, however, and not because of the method of presentation. The style is bombastic, sensational, "yellow." The writer is constantly interjecting observations of his own on all sorts of subjects, about some of which he knows very little. This is especially evident when he tries to show that Burbank has overthrown about all the laws of science. It is impossible to tell how much of the stuff appearing here is rightfully ascribed to Burbank, and how much is the opinion of Mr. Harwood. At any rate it would have improved the book to have omitted it. This is especially evident when the endeavor is made to show that the "inheritance of acquired characteristics" has been proved by Mr. Burbank's experiments. He may have done something of the kind, but Mr. Harwood, in trying to tell about it has only shown that he does not know the meaning of what he criticises. However, there are only a few pages of this sort of stuff and they can easily be skipped without impairing the value of the book.

SOCIALISM, UTOPIAN AND SCIENTIFIC. by *Frederick Engels*. New edition. *Standard Socialist Series*. Charles H. Kerr & Company, cloth, 87 pages, 50 cents.

It has well been said that the history of this book is to a large extent the history of the socialist movement of the world. The present edition is by far the best one yet presented by any American publisher. It is significant of the growth of the movement that of the previous editions issued by the same house twenty thousand copies have been sold. It still remains the one great short classic of socialism, the reading of which along with the "Communist Manifesto" constitutes an absolute essential to an understanding of the socialist movement.

The Twentieth Century Press, of London, England, has issued in a handsome little booklet (price 2 pence) H. M. Hyndman's "*Death and the Socialist Ideal*," which appeared in *Wilshire's* magazine. Now that there seems to be a possibility that socialists may be called upon to engage in physical fighting this work is particularly timely.

The question of the *Massenstreik* is now agitating all Europe, and bids fair to occupy public attention in this country before long. Among the monographs which have appeared on this subject is one of Dr. Rudolph Penzig, published by the Neuer Frankfurter Verlag, on "*Massenstreik und Ethik*." This is devoted to the question as to whether a class struggling for freedom has a right, in order to advance its interests to involve society in such a fierce evil conflict as is involved in the *Massenstreik*.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

THE NEW BOOKS.

In this department of the REVIEW for January we gave full descriptions of fifteen new books which we promised to place in the hands of readers as soon as the necessary capital could be secured. We will not use valuable space in this issue to repeat what was there said. We wish, however to give definite information regarding the progress of the books announced.

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

"The Changing Order," by Oscar Lowell Triggs, Ph. D.; and "Better-World Philosophy," by J. Howard Moore, are now ready, and will be mailed promptly on receipt of price, one dollar each.

"The Universal Kinship," by J. Howard Moore; and "Principles of Scientific Socialism," by Rev. Charles H. Vail, are now being printed and will be ready for delivery during February. Advance orders are solicited at one dollar each.

Dietzgen's "Philosophical Essays" are in type, but the correction of the proofs will consume some time. The first copies can hardly be ready for delivery till about the middle of March.

Two of our standard books, "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History," by Antonio Labriola; and "Love's Coming-of-Age," by Edward Carpenter, are now being re-printed in the attractive style of the International Library of Social Science, and will be the 6th and 7th volumes. Others will be announced soon.

THE STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES.

"The Positive School of Criminology," by Enrico Ferri, translated by Ernest Untermann, is nearly printed as we go to press with this issue of the REVIEW, and will be ready for mailing by about the time this announcement is in the hands of our readers. Price, 50 cents.

"The World's Revolutions," by Ernest Untermann, is in type and nearly ready for the press, and will be ready the last of February or early in March. Price, 50 cents.

"Social and Philosophical Studies," by Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr, has been unavoidably delayed, and as the proofs have to be sent to the author in Paris, copies can not be ready before May.

"The Socialists, who they are and what they stand for," by John Spargo, is a new propaganda work of first-class importance, the publication of which has been arranged for since the January REVIEW went to press. This book will be published in March as the 14th volume of the Standard Socialist Series. A full description of it will be given next month; meanwhile advance orders are solicited. Price, 50 cents.

THE LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS.

"The Triumph of Life," by Wilhelm Boelsche, translated by May Wood Simons, is already in type as we go to press with the February REVIEW, and will be ready for mailing about the 20th. Several hundred advance orders have already been received, and the indications are that the book will have a sale even larger than that of "The Evolution of Man." Price, 50 cents.

A. M. Simons has nearly completed his translation of "Life and Death," by Dr. E. Teichmann, and we expect copies about the last of March.

Ernest Untermann has also nearly finished his translation of Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer's, "The Making of the World," and the printing will be finished some time in April.

We have been able to meet the printing bills as fast as they have come due, but the necessary outlay during February will be very heavy, and we ask every reader of the REVIEW to co-operate by sending at once a cash order for some of the new books. We are already giving better value for the money, as a simple business proposition, than the capitalist publishers of American copyright books. In saying this we refer to our retail prices. But those who buy many socialist books usually prefer to take advantage of our co-operative plan. By paying ten dollars for a share of stock, you get the right to buy our books at half the retail prices if sent at purchaser's expense, or forty per cent. discount if we pay postage.

The money received from the sale of stock is used to publish more socialist books. We only want ten dollars from each stockholder, because we want to place the future control of the publishing house in the hands of a great body of socialists. There are now over twelve hundred stockholders.

OUR RECORD FOR 1905.

The annual stockholders' meeting of the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Co. was held on January 15th. The report there made showed a most remarkable and gratifying improvement in the conditions of the business. It showed that during the past year books had been sold to the amount of \$10,587.37, that \$2,356.87 had been received for

the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, and that donations to the amount of \$1,686.35 had been received. One hundred and ninety-three new stockholders have entered the corporation during the past year, bringing a substantial increase in capital, and what is more important still, a wide extension of buyers, readers and distributors of socialist literature. The interest bearing debt to non-stockholders was practically wiped out and for the first time in the history of the company the receipts from sales of literature showed an actual balance over expense. The additional capital which had been contributed made possible the publication of more books during the past year than in any three previous years in the history of the company. The outlook for the forthcoming year would seem to indicate that this record in turn would be far exceeded during 1906. Seymour Stedman was elected to the board of directors and as secretary of the company for the ensuing year. Charles H. Kerr and A. M. Simons were re-elected as president and vice-president respectively.

OUR RECORD FOR JANUARY.

In the past history of the publishing house the book sales for one calendar month have never exceeded one thousand dollars. The sales of books during January, 1906, were \$1,232.19. The receipts on the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for the month were \$293.58, the income from subscriptions to stock \$301.28, and there were cash contributions from J. A. Teit, 60 cents; Dr. H. M. Wilson, \$1.60; and Wm. A. Schmidt, \$5.00; making the total receipts of the month, \$1,834.25.

WHAT TO READ ON SOCIALISM.

Four years ago under this title we published a booklet of thirty-two pages, the size to slip into a letter. It told what there was to tell about the books we had then. A little over two years ago, under the same title, we published a book of thirty-six pages the size of this REVIEW. Now we have in press a book of sixty-four pages under the same title. Each page will contain two columns each two and two-thirds inches wide and over eight inches long. The margins will be narrow and the paper will be light, because it is important to keep the postage on each book inside one cent. The book will contain first the substance of the five leaflets by Charles H. Kerr entitled, "What Socialists Think," which have been extensively circulated by the Socialist Party organization. There has been some complaint that these leaflets were not bound together instead of being printed separately, and it has been thought best to re-print them as an introduction to "What to Read." (A few thousands of the leaflets can still be had at \$1.50 per thousand sets, but they will not be re-printed.)

The remainder of the new book, after a brief explanation of the workings of our co-operative publishing house, will be taken up with descriptions of our literature. There will be one peculiar thing about these descriptions, distinguishing them from the advertising matter prepared by capitalist publishing houses. That is to say, the object of each

description is not to convince the reader that each individual book is the best ever written and should be ordered at all hazards. On the contrary, the object of each description is to enable the reader to judge to the best of his ability what information or entertainment each book does or does not offer, so that he may make an intelligent selection, and be pleased instead of disappointed when he comes to read the books. It is on this plan that our book advertising has been prepared from the start. We might have sold more copies each of a few books by using the other method, but the plan we have chosen has helped us find several thousands of socialist book-buyers who read all our new announcements with interest, and send to us whenever they want books.

To increase this army of readers is our object in printing "What to Read on Socialism." As soon as it is ready, we shall mail a copy to every stockholder, every REVIEW subscriber, every secretary of a socialist local, and every one who has sent us an order for books within the last six months. This will take not far from 10,000 of the pamphlets. But we shall print a first edition of 25,000, because we believe they will be wanted for propaganda. We expect to sell 15,000 copies as soon as the book is off the press. The price will be one dollar a hundred including postage either to one address or as many different addresses as desired, or 50 cents a hundred if expressage is paid by the purchaser. The actual cost of paper, press work and binding will be almost exactly a dollar a hundred, and the postage a dollar a hundred more, so that the price we charge does not begin to cover the cost. We ask a nominal price merely to make sure that all copies sent for will be put where they will be read, not wasted.

Send advance orders now, and the pamphlets will be sent as soon as the printing is finished, which we expect will be about February 25. Orders for less than 100 copies will be filled at the same rate, one cent a copy, postpaid. Better send a dollar with as many addresses as you think of. We will mail one book to each address, and the remainder of the hundred in a package to you. This is by far the best propaganda value for the money that we have ever been able to offer, and we look for an immediate response from the readers of the REVIEW. Address

**Charles H. Kerr & Company (Co-operative),
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.**

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

MARCH, 1906

NO. 9

Garrison, and The Materialistic Interpretation of History.*

THERE is a class of critics which denies the importance of Garrison's services to the country on the ground that all idealists and reformers are mere empty voices, and that none but economic causes affect the condition of men. The world, according to these philosophers, crawls upon its belly, and its brain and heart follow submissively wherever the belly leads. This is known as the "economic interpretation of history," and is particularly affected by Marxian socialists, who believe that state socialism is destined to be established by irresistible economic laws, and that their own idealism and agitation are altogether fruitless; which does not prevent them, however, from laboring and sacrificing themselves for the cause, like the typical idealist. This belief and this behavior is strangely like the Christian doctrine of predestination, the certain triumph of the church, and the fore-ordained election of the saints, which has never interfered with the missionary activity of believers. The disciple of Marx comforts himself with the materialist equivalent of the statement that all things work together for good, and his dogmatism is as strict as that of any Presbyterian sect. It is the old issue of fatalism and free will, the fatalist usually exerting himself to secure his ends much more strenuously than his adversary.

The most complete application of this theory of economic causes to the subject of slavery has been made by an acute so-

*) From Garrison, the Non-Resistant," by Ernest Crosby. Public Publishing Co., Chicago, Cloth, 144 pp. 50 cents.

cialist thinker, Mr. A. M. Simons, in a series of articles in the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* of Chicago during the year 1903. According to him the idealism of Garrison and the Abolitionists—the growing belief in the immorality of slavery and the justice of the demand for freedom, John Brown and his raid, Uncle Tom's Cabin, the battle songs of the North—all these things were phantasmagoria and the people were deceiving themselves.

"The real conflict was between the capital that hired free labor and the capital that owned slave labor."

And Mr. Simons represents the Northern capitalists in the anticipation of a future struggle between themselves and their employes, as deliberately determining that the capitalists of the South should not enjoy the "privilege of an undisturbed industry." It seems to me that anyone who can believe this can believe anything that he wishes to. The fact is that slave labor did not compete with the free labor of the North. The South had a practical monopoly of the production of cotton, tobacco, rice and sugar, and slavery was chiefly confined to that production. The relative cheapness or dearness of slave labor had consequently no appreciable effect on Northern labor; and if it had, it is absurd to suppose that Northern capital appreciated the fact or brought about the war for any such reason. It is true that the North desired a protective tariff for its manufactures, and that the South preferred free trade so that it might have a world-wide market for its cotton. It is true that North and South each desired to control the national government. But no war would have been fought if the South had not seceded; the South would not have seceded unless she had feared for the future of slavery; and slavery would not have been menaced except for the agitation of the anti-slavery people of the North with Garrison at their head.

As a matter of fact, human idealism enters into all the works of man; and the philosophy which asserts that poetry and religion spring from economic conditions and nothing else, is erroneous or at least one-sided. That mind and body are so intermingled that they reach upon each other, is undoubtedly true, and our extreme idealist needs to be reminded now and then that the bread and butter factor must not be forgotten; but to assert that mind is made of bread and butter is going much too far, and it ignores the commonest experiences of human consciousness. Man's wish—man's will—is a force to be dealt with. Even ordinary hunger involves wish and will in the choice of food. Is our present civilization governed partially by the yield of wheat? But wheat itself is a human creation. The first man who tasted a grain of wild wheat and liked it and proceeded to sow other similar grains was moved as much

by fancy as by economic necessity. And there is hunger and hunger. There is a hunger and thirst for knowledge, and a hunger and thirst after righteousness, and many other hungers and thirsts which must all be reckoned with in the study of evolution. And man can see the workings of this side of evolution in his own mind. I have become a vegetarian, for instance, and I am unable to detect any economic reason for my change of diet. I know many others of whom the same is true. In time the increase in the number of such vegetarians will produce an appreciable effect upon the economic condition of mankind, and here clearly will be a change occasioned in large part by pure idealism. The same is true of socialism, and I know many leading socialists who so far from having been impelled to socialism by economic motives, would be economic losers by its victory. And so with the temperance movement, the peace movements, the movement for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and many others. I am conscious and every man is conscious of doing things every day against mere economic interests, and I do not refer exclusively to philanthropy by any means. The millionaire who spends his money on a trip to Europe instead of saving it overrules his economic interests on account of his higher desire for novel experiences, and he does the same thing when he pays for a superfluous ornament on his house. To overlook men's desires is to overlook life itself, and in the record of the living actions of men the thought precedes the thing. You cannot have a dinner without thinking it out beforehand, nor build a house without plans. You might wait till dooms-day for "economic conditions" to roast a potato for you. The will of man must intervene before the miracle is performed, and sometimes he wills to rise above his economic conditions and refuses to bend before them.

In short, the "economic interpretation of history" is equivalent to the brick interpretation of a house (leaving the architect and the owner who ordered it built out of the question)—that is, no interpretation at all. Economic conditions are more often the limitation than the source of evolution. The exertion of our powers is more or less bounded by our materials, and events which are not economically possible are not likely to happen; but things are not yet in the saddle and the socialist movement, with its devoted and self-forgetful leaders, gives ample proof of it. It is curious to note that our extreme materialists call themselves "scientific socialists" and our extreme idealists, who deny the existence of matter, take the name of "Christian scientists." True "science" lies between these extremes and perhaps it is wise to fight shy of those who advertise their "science" too conspicuously.

In the history of slavery the element of human will and

initiative is particularly prominent. A sentimental bishop was the first to suggest the importation of Africans to America in order to relieve the Indians from the labor which their spirit could not brook. It was a philanthropic business at the start. Indians would not work, Negroes would. Here again the human factor asserted itself. The Cavalier immigrants of the South did not like to work, the Puritans of the North did; hence one of the reasons that slavery flourished only below Mason and Dixon's line. Mr. Simons refers to this fact as "one of those strange happenings" called "coincidences." The interesting point lies," he goes on to say, "in the fact that in Europe it was just the Cavalier who represented the old feudal organization of society with its servile system of labor, while the Puritan is the representative of the rapidly rising bourgeoisie which was to rest upon the status of wage-slavery." "Strange happening," "coincidence," "interesting point." This is certainly most naive. There was no reason why slaves should not be employed in the North in raising wheat as well as in the South in raising cotton, except that the Northerners did not want them, and heredity as well as climate goes to account for the difference. Mr. Simons himself quotes from the work of an antebellum author a reference to German settlers who, "true to their national instincts, will not employ the labor of a slave." And in fine, as if to show how little he is convinced by his own arguments, Mr. Simons says of this same volume (Helper's "Impending Crisis"), "This book had a most remarkable circulation in the years immediately preceding the war, and probably if the truth as to the real factors which made public opinion could be determined, it had far more to do with bringing on the Civil War than did 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,'" which involves an admission as to the latter book as well as to the former. Books and arguments and ideals had their leading part to play in the abolition of slavery, and the very adversaries of the belief cannot get away from it. "Public opinion" is and always has been a determining element in history, and it is swayed by novels and agitators and poets. Garrison still has his place in history.

Science vs. Mysticism — A Reply.

WHILE the foregoing criticism by Mr. Ernest Crosby is filled with misconceptions and misinterpretations of the doctrine he attacks, yet on the whole it is about as good a short presentation of the ordinary arguments against the socialist position as I remember having seen. I am all the more led to consider the particular problem which he discusses since one of the foremost socialist papers in the United States has recently taken almost the same position as Mr. Crosby regarding the function of Garrison and his fellow abolitionists.

First as to the misunderstandings. It is a grotesque travesty on the truth to claim that according to the economic interpretation of history, the world "crawls upon its belly, and its brain and heart follow submissively where the belly leads." The socialist never stated that the food desire was the only one influencing man. He has emphasized far more than his opponents that there is a "hunger and thirst" for a great variety of things besides food and drink for the belly. He has never attempted to formulate a philosophy which overlooked these desires, and has always maintained that it was the way in which man satisfied *all* his desires that determined his social institutions. Until the present time society has been mainly concerned with the satisfaction of the "belly desires," and consequently social institutions have been governed by the manner in which these desires were satisfied to a much larger degree than Mr. Crosby may be willing to believe.

The next misunderstanding is one for which there is really no excuse. It is as moss-grown with age as the "don't-want-to-divide-up" and the "coming-slavery" nonsense. This is all the more inexcusable on Mr. Crosby's part since this point was thoroughly explained by Mrs. May Wood Simons in one of the very numbers of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW containing the articles which he criticises.

I refer to his silly, catchy comparison of Marxism with Predestination, and his sneers at the "fatalist" socialist who still engages in propaganda work. Undoubtedly the old alchemist, who sought to accomplish the transmutation of metals would have similarly sneered at the contradiction of a modern chemist, who should at the same time believe in chemical laws, and still seek to compound drugs. We can imagine the supercilious sarcasm with which a similar reasoner might have

greeted Newton, and how he would have been denounced as a contradictory fatalist if he dared to suggest that bodies could still be moved notwithstanding they obeyed the laws of gravitation. The comparison is a correct one and will bear further elaboration. The man who knows no social laws, who trusts to sentiment and preaching, without considering whether what he seeks to accomplish is in accord with social evolution and the laws of social growth, is exactly comparable to the old alchemist and "medicine man" or witch doctor; while the socialist, who first seeks to discover the laws according to which society must evolve, and the forces by which its structure is determined, and then works in accord with those laws and forces, is the social prototype of the modern chemist and physicist, who studies physical and chemical laws in order to use them.

Chance, luck, incantations, charms, and the "medicine man" philosophy in general, have been driven from all other fields of phenomena save that of society. Just because it is to the material interest of the ruling portion of present society to deny the validity or even the existence of such laws we still have social conjurers who seek to produce results without regard to the laws which govern the forces and phenomena with which they deal. Another reason why social laws are slower in obtaining recognition is found in their greater complexity, and in the fact that each social organization, like each chemical combination, or each species of animal or plant life has its own laws of growth and operation. No body of thinkers who approached the subject from any but the proletarian point of view could avoid the first difficulty in any social stage, and in the stage of capitalism there are also special advantages from this method of approach in meeting the second difficulty. For these reasons it is not pure bigoted conceit, that leads the socialist to claim that he alone has the true position in regard to the great fundamentals of social life and evolution. He is all the more confirmed in this belief by the fact that his philosophy has grown with ever conquering force in all nations of the earth in the face of the most bitter criticism from without and the keenest examination from within. To-day he offers the results of this philosophy, not as presenting a fatalist obstacle to social activity, but as offering a means of intelligent *scientific activity* comparable to that which takes place in all other fields of human endeavor.

Let me say this all over again, so that even the stupidist may never have occasion to bring up this objection again. So long as people thought that diseases were cured by charms, that crops were governed by luck, that plagues were a visitation of God, there was little chance for the rise of the sciences of healing, or agriculture or sanitation. But when it was learned that these things were governed by inexorable "irresistible" laws,

then the growth of the science was in exact degree to the growth of the knowledge of these laws. The same thing is true in the science of society. So long as men believe that social changes come by chance, through the efforts of great men, or inspired geniuses, there can be no social science, nor effective intelligent working for social change. Just as the astrologist, the alchemist and the medicine man occasionally happened to perform their charms or chant their incantations at the particular moment in which the desired change was about to take place, and so got credit for what happened; just so the particular social prophet who was lucky enough to guess which way things were going, before other people saw the trend of events, or who unconsciously worked in accord with the social laws, came to be looked upon by those who accept what might be called the "medicine man interpretation of history" as the cause of the event. On the other hand, when the socialist discovered some of the laws of social evolution and proceeded to act in accord with them for the accomplishment of certain definite social changes he was the social counterpart of the engineer, the physicist and the trained scientist in all other fields, who produce results by the *application* of known laws.

If this does not forever lay the ghost of this "fatalistic" contradiction, then I will simply have to admit that there are those who will still cling to their charms and incantations in the social world just as others continue to carry the left hind feet of grave-yard rabbits.

The third misunderstanding is also an extremely common one, and one for which there is not the slightest excuse, since socialists have over and over again made their position so plain that it would seem that a "way-faring man though a fool" might still understand it. This lies in the assertion that socialists take no account of idealism as a possible social force. Once more, had Mr. Crosby read the article to which reference was previously made, he would have found this objection met. I quote from the article in question to show the density of understanding on the part of those who would still insist that socialists are blind to the existence of these forces. "The systems of justice, morality, etc., which have arisen in previous social stages undoubtedly have a part in determining social institutions to-day." Every adherent of the materialistic or economic interpretation of history since Marx, has recognized this fact. The socialists have done more than this. They have explained the origin and the methods by which these forces work. I continue to quote the sentences which follow the one just given: "But how? They constitute the material upon which present economic environment must act, and they may so resist that environment as to greatly alter it. But when we analyze this back to its ultimate

we find that it is not a conflict between ideas and environment, but a conflict between a past and a present environment." From this fact it follows that an idea which did not correspond to the environment and the direction of social growth would be doomed to disappearance; and if it did so correspond then it would be unconsciously working in accord with the very laws which the socialist points out. In the same way the "medicine man" did sometimes hit upon the proper herbs to cure the patient, but that is a poor argument for "medicine man" therapeutics.

Once more we will try to repeat this thought so that it may be thoroughly understood. The socialist recognizes that ideas are effective in the social realm, just as they are in any other field, only when *applied in accordance with social laws*; just as the ideas of the engineer are only effective when applied in accordance with the laws of physics. The engineer might sit and dream, and then preach and pray and denounce and agitate until the crack of doom and he could not build a sky-scraper out of butter, or a bridge without foundations. In the same way a Garrison might have been crying out against slavery without ever disturbing the status of the negro, if it had not happened that the owners of wage-slaves wanted the government which the chattel slave owners possessed, and got into a war about the matter, in the midst of which they blockaded southern ports, destroyed plantations, burned cities and transformed the negro into a wage-slave.

There is plenty more in Mr. Crosby's general observations that might serve as texts to illustrate the perversity of those who will not see, or upon which to preach sermons on the economic interpretation of history. I shall pass these over, however, believing that none of them present any difficulties to anyone who chooses to apply the principles already explained.

Now as to the particular example which he offers as illustrative of the "medicine man" incantation, idealistic theory of history. According to Mr. Crosby the "element of human will and initiative is particularly prominent" in the history of slavery. I shall not here reproduce the mass of evidence which appeared in the original articles which he criticises.*)

I shall take only the incidents he cites, supposing that, like a good general, he has chosen the strongest positions and that if these are overthrown the whole citadel will be forced to capitulate. He asserts that "A sentimental bishop was the first to suggest the importation of Africans to America in order to

*) The two issues of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, covering the period since the adoption of the constitution, can be furnished to anyone who wishes. Price fifteen cents postpaid.

relieve the Indians from the labor which their spirit would not brook." As Mr. Crosby says, "It seems to me that anyone who can believe this, can believe anything he wants to." This is the "medicine man interpretation of history" with a vengeance. Just because a Spanish bishop chanced to suggest to the mine owners of Spain, who were on the look-out for men to murder for money in their American mines, that negroes might be substituted for the Indians, who had shown a disposition to object to being tortured in the underground hells of the new world, are we therefore to believe that it was religious sentimentality that introduced negro slavery to America? Does it sound probable that if this suggestion had not been made that it never would have occurred to the slave-traders, who had been plying their trade for several years before Columbus landed on the shore of San Salvador, that there was a possible profitable market for their wares on the western shores of the Atlantic?

I never represented "the Northern capitalists in the anticipation of future struggles between themselves and their employes, as deliberately determining that the capitalists of the South should not enjoy the 'privilege of an undisturbed industry,'" and there is nothing in the articles criticised that justifies such a statement. That this possibility was foreseen at that time was pointed out by me as a remarkable example of foresight, but too few persons possessed that foresight to make it an effective social force. I would add to the quotations given in my former article the following from John C. Calhoun, as showing that there were those at that time who were able to believe this unbelievable thing, and these the very men who were shaping events — if we are to accept the great man theory of history:

"There is, and always has been, in an advanced stage of wealth and civilization, a conflict between labor and capital. The condition of society in the South exempts us from the disorders and dangers resulting from this conflict; and explains why it is that the condition of the slaveholding states has been so much more staple and quiet than that of the North."

The central point upon which I insisted in my original article, and which I believe I was the first to present in anything like a complete form, was that the Civil War was a struggle between two divisions of the ruling class — the southern chattel slave owner, and the northern buyer of wage labor, for control of the national government, and that the North did not set out with the intention of "freeing" the slave any more than the South aimed at the "enslavement" of the northern wage worker. In the midst of the war, and as a war measure, and certainly not as a result of abolitionist agitation, the Emancipation Proclama-

tion was issued. Up until that Proclamation was issued the Republican Party steadfastly refused to favor abolition. I could easily cite almost numberless proofs of this fact, if it is disputed. But when the negro was "freed" and given a ballot, and was needed by the "carpet-bagger" and the "scalawag" in "Reconstruction" times, then the "freeing of the negro" became one of the valuable assets of the Republican Party, and was worked for all it was worth. Then they began to idolize the old abolitionists, and to claim to have agreed with them all the time.

There are some other rather remarkable statements in Mr. Crosby's work. He tells us that, "There was no reason why slaves should not be employed in the North in raising wheat as well as in the South in raising cotton, except that the Northerners did not want them." There are a few things that seriously interfere with the accuracy of that sentence. First, negroes were "employed in the North in growing wheat" for a while. Second, there was a very good "reason why" that employment was not continued and that was that it did not pay. Third, the Northerners did "want them," and when they found they could not use them at home they very willingly sold them to their southern brethren; like the woman, who became convinced that her jewels were dragging her soul down to eternal damnation, and so gave them to her sister. This myth about the Puritan heredity and morals which led to abolitionism has been exploded so often that it seems a pity to hit it again, but so long as there are those who believe in witch doctors it will still be necessary to repeat the platitudes of elementary hygiene. Says McMaster "If the infamy of holding slaves belongs to the South, the greater infamy of supplying slaves must be shared by England and the North." It was the Puritan owners of the Boston clippers, who stole the slaves in Africa, or bought them with adulterated rum, and then brought them to the southern planters. If the "horrors of the cotton plantation" must be charged to the account of the Cavalier, the Puritan must answer for the ten-fold greater "horrors of the middle passage." In short, both sides believed in, defended and practiced chattel slavery just as far as it was profitable, and no farther.

Mr. Crosby seems to think that he has caught me in a ridiculous contradiction when I stated that Helper's "Impending Crisis" had much to do with bringing on the Civil War. On the contrary, this is an illustration of the point at issue,—that the social agitator is only effective when he works in accord with social laws. Helper showed the unprofitableness of slavery. He demonstrated that it was to the material interest of a great portion of the population to abolish it and to substitute wage-slavery. He showed that the latter increased profits, built cities and railroads, fostered commerce, and raised the price of land.

He called upon the southern non-slaveholders to vote in their own interest and not blindly follow the slavocracy. It was these things that caused his book to reach a larger circulation than any other work filled with dry statistics and dull reading ever reached before or since, and that raised the South to such a point of rage that possession of the book was made a crime in many states, and having sympathized with its circulation defeated John Sherman for the position of speakership of the House of Representatives. The fervid eloquence of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" may have stirred up the sentimental maiden ladies of Massachusetts, but unfortunately (and also unjustly, as I will be the first to agree) they were not in a position to make their voice felt in the affairs of state. But Helper put his hand upon the pocket-book lever, that then, as now, ruled, and so helped, to a slight extent at least, to set the wheels in motion, which eventuated in the victory of the Republican Party, the secession of the South and The Emancipation Proclamation.

That secession was an absolute necessity if the profits in slavery were to be preserved. Chattel servitude could not succeed with the capitalist class of the North in power. The industrial system of the South was so different from that of the North, especially after capitalism had developed, that it required an almost diametrically opposite use of the national government. The influence of the little body of abolitionists in bringing about either the war or abolition was almost infinitesimal, and this just because they were not working in accord with the laws which were governing the society in which they lived.

If Mr. Crosby believes that he can further substantiate his position or prove the error of the materialistic interpretation of history I hope that will continue his criticisms. The socialist, as always, has "everything to gain and nothing to lose," by free discussion, and I cheerfully and gladly tender him the columns of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for this purpose.

A. M. SIMONS.

Economic Contradictions and The Passing of Capitalism.

I N the preceding articles we have endeavored to show the purpose of Marx's inquiry into the laws of exchange-value, and how those laws furnish the key to the understanding of the *Workings* of the capitalist system of production and distribution.

We have examined the capitalist system *as it is*, without going into the question of its origin, except to note the fact that it had an historic origin, that is to say, that it is not eternal or even immemorial in its existence but is a historical phenomenon having had its origin within the recorded memory of men.

We have examined some of the tendencies of its development, but only within its confines. We have examined some of the tendencies in the development and distribution of the mass of surplus-value produced *in* the capitalist system while it lasts. The question of its lasting, as to its extent and form, we have not touched upon. We might say, *a priori*; that since the capitalistic system is only a historic phenomenon it will certainly not last forever. While this is true, it is of no importance whatsoever, unless we can say with some degree of certainty that the passing of this system is of such proximity that its end can be seen, and this is only possible if its end is so near that we can discern its form, or rather the form of the system which is to succeed and supplant it. This again, can only be determined, if at all, from an examination of the tendencies of the capitalist system, and the laws governing it, followed out to their ultimate and logical results so as to see whether they lead beyond the capitalist system itself. And if so, whither are we drifting?

Should a careful and exhaustive examination of the tendencies of the capitalist system fail to lead to any beyond, then we must accept the capitalist system as unlimited in duration for all practical purposes. For the social system, which is to succeed the capitalist form of society must be born and developed within the bowels of capitalism, and it will come into existence only after the passing of capitalism shall come about as the necessary and logical result of the full development of the laws of its own being. And it will be long before the end of the old system, and the birth of the new one will come, that the signs of decaying old age and of the new germs of life will manifest themselves to the intelligent observer.

The examination which Marx made of the capitalist system has not only revealed to him the laws which govern the production and distribution of wealth within the system, but also the *historical* tendencies of its development which show its place in history with reference to its origin as well as its passing. His work, "Capital," is therefore not only an explanation of the workings of the capitalist system, but also an historical estimate, an appreciation thereof. The sub-title of the work, "A Critique of Political Economy," refers not so much to the theories of the political economists who preceded him with reference to the explanation of the actual workings of the capitalist system, as to their failure to appreciate the tendencies and the laws of capitalism which will lead to its ultimate passing away. According to Marx, the capitalist system of production and distribution is so full of inherent contradictions, that its own development, if the laws of its own existence are permitted to freely assert themselves, *will lead* to its ultimate and speedy destruction. For, not only are the laws of capitalism inherently contradictory, but the development of capitalism has already reached that stage where the contradictions upon which it rests make themselves felt to its own detriment, and the forces and elements which are to work its destruction and supplant it are maturing rapidly before our very eyes. So does the system which is to take the place of capitalism take definite shape and outline, so that its general form and appearance stand clearly before our vision inscribed: Socialism.

Before proceeding however any further with this examination our attention is called to a question which might interfere with the progress of our inquiry unless answered right here. There is perhaps no question which leads to as much discussion, and as contradictory opinions, since the advent of Revisionism, than the question of the relation between the theory of value and socialism in the Marxian system. The cleavage of opinion is in the main along the lines of orthodox and revisionist Marxism, the former claiming an intimate relation and interdependence between these parts of the Marxian theory, and the latter denying it. This alignment on the present question is not very strict, however; and absolutely irreconcilable opinions on this subject are held by Marx-critics belonging to the same camp. A glance into the discussion of this subject will again reveal the almost hopeless state of ignorance of the Marxian theory which prevails even among the ablest of Marx-critics.

According to Tugan-Baranowsky (who agrees in this respect with most orthodox Marxists) Marx based his socialism entirely on what he thought to be the laws of capitalistic development resulting from the peculiarities of the law of value which

forms its keynote. Oppenheimer and Simkhowitch, however, and a host of others, insist that Marx's theory of value has nothing whatever to do with his socialism.

Curiously enough, Tugan-Baranowsky on the one hand and Oppenheimer and Simkhowitch on the other, all claim one and the same passage in Engels as authority in support of their respective positions; which adds no little to the bewilderment of the simple-minded reader. The treatment which this particular passage from Engels has received, and the uses to which it was put, is very characteristic of up-to-date Marx-criticism, particularly of the Revisionist brand: Detached passages, sentences and phrases, from Marx and Engels are bandied about without the slightest attention being paid to the particular context or connection in which they were used, thus often making them yield an entirely different meaning from that intended by the author. The result is that everybody proves by Marx and Engels themselves whatever opinions he pleases to ascribe to them, a most fruitful field is provided for the adherents of the theory of evolution in Marxism, and a plentiful harvest is assured to the gatherer of Marxian contradictions.

V. G. Simkhowitch, who has to his credit one of the wordiest essays on Marxism, published in one of the most learned German magazines, says: "Marx's socialist demands and his theory of value are genetically related, but systematically considered there is no connection whatever between them. In saying this I merely repeat something which is self-evident to every philosophically educated person who has grasped the Marxian philosophy (*Weltanschauung*). Anybody who cares can find specific statements to that effect in Marx and Engels. So says Engels about the relation of Marx's socialism to his theory of value: Marx therefore never based his communistic demands thereon, but on the inevitable breakdown of the capitalistic mode of production which we daily see approaching its end. And in the literature of Marxism this has always been insisted on."

At the risk of being accounted philosophically uneducated we shall have to disagree with our philosophic Marx-critic along with others, for reasons which will presently appear. Just now however it is the passage quoted from Engels that interests us. We must say most emphatically that Engels never said any such thing as he is made to say by our philosophically educated critic. Not that the *words* quoted are not Engels'. The words were used by Engels, sure enough. But their *meaning* is entirely different. For Engels did not say this, "About the relation of Marx's socialism to his theory of value" as Simkhowitch (and Oppenheimer) seem to think, but about something else, which exactly reverses the meaning of the passage. In his preface to Marx's "Misery of Philosophy," Engels says that long before

Marx some socialists attempted to base their socialism on the Ricardian theory of value, claiming that since, according to Ricardo, labor is the source of all value, the laborers are entitled to all the value produced, which means to the whole social product. And then he goes on to say:

"The above application of the Ricardian theory, namely, that to the workingmen, as the only real producers, belongs the entire social product, *their* product, leads directly to communism. This application is, however, as Marx points out in the passage quoted above, economically formally false, for it is simply the application of ethics to economics. According to the laws of capitalistic economics the greatest portion of the product *does not* belong to the workingmen who produced it. We may say: this is wrong, it must not be. But that has nothing to do with economics. We merely say by this, that this economic fact is opposed to our moral feelings.

Marx therefore never based his communistic demands thereon, but on the inevitable break-down of the capitalist mode of production which we daily see approaching its end."

Our philosophically educated critic evidently got things somewhat mixed. Marx never based his communistic demands on the *moral application* of the Ricardian, or his own theory of value. Nor on any morality for that matter. Therein he differed from the utopian socialists who preceded him and from such of those who followed him, who, like Bernstein for instance, have returned to the moral application of economic theories. That is why Bernstein and the rest of the Revisionists do not see the connection between the Marxian theory of value and his socialism. Any theory of value will do for them as long as it permits, or they think it permits, the *moral* application which they are after. And as any theory might be made to yield such a moral to those who look for it, they have become indifferent to theories of value in general. Not so with Marx. His socialism is scientific as distinguished from utopian based on moral applications, in that it is the result of "the inevitable breakdown of the capitalistic mode of production." But this inevitable breakdown can only be understood and explained by the aid of the Marxian theory of value, that is why his theory of value and his socialism are so intimately connected in his system. Marx based his socialism on his theory of value. But on its economic results, not on its moral application. And it is due to the lack of understanding on the part of his critics of what Marx conceived to be the economic results of his theory of value, that the discussion of the relation between his theory of value and his socialism is still going on, and his and Engels' writings are still being put to all sorts of uses.

The law of value which lies at the basis of capitalism contain within itself according to Marx, a mass of contradictions which lead in the development of capitalist society to the formation of a series of antagonistic elements which must ultimately result in its breakdown. While these contradictions and antagonisms are developed by the same economic process, they are not all of a strictly economic nature, and may have results of what is usually considered a moral character.

While the facts themselves which will lead to the displacement of the capitalist system must be of a strictly economic nature, that is to say the capitalistic mode of production and distribution must become a fetter upon production before it can be overthrown, the actual power which will overthrow it, or at least the form which it will assume in the consciousness of the men who will do this work, may be of a moral or ethical nature. For man possesses the peculiarity of placing absolute standards on relative matters, and he calls moral everything that accelerates his progress on any road which he may be travelling, and immoral everything that retards this progress. When he finds, therefore, that any given arrangement is in his way he declares it to be immoral and fights it with all the force of his "moral nature."

He may, therefore, be depended upon to make a moral issue of, and lead a crusade against, anything that will stand in the way of his economic progress. It is to the economic facts of capitalism that we must therefore look for the basis of socialism.

In order to properly appreciate these facts, we must go back a little to the beginning of our examination of the capitalist system. We have there noted the difference between the wealth of capitalistic society and that of the forms of society which preceded it. We have noted that difference to be in the fact that capitalistic wealth is an aggregation of commodities. This, as was also already noted, is due to the circumstance that the purpose of capitalistic production is different from that of any former mode of production.

This difference in the purpose of production, production for the market instead of for use has wrought a change in the process of distribution of the social product between the different social elements which are to share therein. Under former systems of production this process was a very simple one, and the persons engaged in it were conscious and well aware of what they were doing. It was an extra-economic process, in a way, the real economic process being confined to the process of production. It was in the capitalist system that the process of distribution first became an unconscious, "natural," and economic process, by the addition to the process of production of the cir-

culatation-process of commodities, as part of the general economic process of society, and that part of it in which the distribution of the produced commodities among those entitled thereto is to take place.

From the capitalist standpoint the circulation process of commodities is the most important of the economic processes. Not, however, because it is only by this process that the produced commodities reach their social destination, the consumers, but because it is in this process that all value, including the surplus-value, the cause and aim of capitalistic production, is realized. Until realized in the circulation process, all value produced for the capitalist, "necessary" as well as "surplus," is only potential value, liable to be destroyed at any moment by some change in the social conditions of its production or distribution. In order that the capitalist class may obtain its surplus-value, the whole value must not only be produced but consumed, either absolutely or productively. And in order that the individual capitalist may obtain his share of the fund of surplus-value created for his class, the value in the production or circulation of which he is economically engaged must be consumed as far as he is concerned, that is to say, it must reach his immediate consumer.

This process of the realization of value and of the distribution of the surplus-value in the circulation-process of commodities is presided over by the God of capitalism—Competition—who, as all the world knows, is "the life of trade." The share of the surplus-value which each individual capitalist obtains depending on his success in this competition, the source of all surplus-value has been lost sight of, and the importance of the circulation process grossly exaggerated. It has, however, a real and vital importance to the capitalist class, for it is here that the surplus-value produced elsewhere is actually realized.

The essentials of capitalism are therefore three. Private Property; a free working class; and Competition. Private property in the means of production is, of course, at the foundation of the capitalist system as it is of all societies divided into classes. In this it does not differ from other class-societies which preceded it. Not so with the other two elements. They were almost unknown to the social systems which preceded it, but are absolutely essential to capitalism. We have already seen how important a role competition plays in the realization and distribution of the surplus-value among the members of the capitalist class. It also plays an important part in determining the relative amount of the surplus in all the values that are produced, as we shall have occasion to see later.

This however, depends on the third element, the free working-class. The working-class in order to serve as an efficient

instrument of capitalist production must be absolutely free. "Free," as Marx says, both from personal bondage and from the ties of property. Were the workingmen to be burdened with property, the whole edifice of capitalism would be impossible for the commodity, labor-power would then be absent from the market and the possession of the necessary and surplus-values would then be united in the same person, which would extinguish all difference between them. Production of commodities would also be next to impossible were the workingmen not free personally so as to be able to sell their labor-power to the highest bidder. Competition among the producers would then be impossible. For competition implies equality of opportunity, whereas under such conditions the opportunity of production would depend on the possession of workingmen. Besides, production or abstention from production would then depend not on the choice of the capitalist but on the number of workingmen he possessed. He could not produce if he possessed none, and would be compelled to produce if he possessed them. For it is of the essence of a slave that he must be fed, and consequently worked. The presence of these three elements together turns the means of production into "Capital," and gives the laws of capitalism free play. Hence, free trade is the typical policy of capitalism, as is the "free" employment of private property, personal liberty and right to contract, with all that it implies. And protection in any form, or the interference with property and liberty in any manner, is a sign of either an imperfectly developed capitalism, or of a capitalism in a stage of decay and tottering to its fall.

What, then, are the tendencies of the development of these elements of the capitalistic system? How do they influence one another in the course of their development? And how is the production and realization of surplus-value, the aim and purpose of capitalistic economic activity affected by the sum-total of these influences?

The growth of capitalism, in so far as it is not merely expansion over an increased area, but development of force and power, means the rapid accumulation of capital, more particularly of machinery of production and circulation. All the great masses of our wealth consist of this machinery with the exception of that part of it which consists of land, which, as we have seen, gets its value from the reflex action of this machinery. The accumulation of machinery does not mean, however, the mere piling up of machinery upon machinery, that is to say, it does not mean the mere *addition* of machinery of the same kind to that which already exists. The process of accumulation starts out, of course, by addition of machinery of the same kind. But it does not proceed very far in that way. The real spring of the process consists in the constant invention of ever newer and

costlier machinery. The economic value of this machinery (that is its value as an economic force) consists in its labor-saving quality. It is of the essence of every new invention that it must be labor-saving in some way, otherwise it is useless to capital. This mechanical law of the accumulation of capital finds its economic expression in the law of the rising organic composition of capital.

The essence of all new machinery introduced in the process of accumulation of capital being its labor-saving quality, and the purpose of its introduction being the replacing of costly live-labor by a cheaper mechanical process, the accumulation of capital is only possible by the constant replacement of live-labor by machinery, by the ever-recurring forcing out of employment of great masses of labor. Thus, this mechanical law of the accumulation of capital, which as we have seen, finds its economic expression in the rising organic composition of capital and therefore in the falling rate of profits, finds its sociological expression in the capitalistic law of relative over-population.

That is to say, that under capitalism a country may become over-populated with *relation* to the needs of capital or of the capitalist class in laborers, and large masses of its population may thereby lose their means of productive employment and therefore their means of subsistence, while the absolute needs as well as means of employment and subsistence are quite sufficient to provide for all its members. The Malthusian law, whatever *else* may be said of it, certainly has no application to the question of population under the capitalist system of society. For aside from the question whether there are any "natural" laws governing the growth of population and of the means of subsistence, such laws, if there be any, would be quite superfluous and inoperative under capitalism. For the very processes by which capital is being accumulated produce an over-population long before the natural limit of population could be reached, and that limit is therefore never reached under capitalism.

The laborers who are continually being thrown out of employment by the introduction of new, labor-saving, machinery, are thereafter absorbed in whole or in part by the process of production, when the new capital, or the old capital in its new form, has had sufficient time to expand and accumulate on the new basis so as to need new "hands." This process of absorption continues as long as the accumulation proceeds on this new (soon to become old) basis of production, and until it has sufficiently accumulated to require, and has actually found, a new basis of production in the further invention of some newer machinery. When this occurs there is a new "freeing" of a mass of workingmen from the bondage of employment, and the process begins all over anew.

This constant hunt for additional surplus-value, here by expanding the old processes of production by constantly employing more labor and here by changing the processes so as to narrow down its base of human labor, in short: the process of accumulation of capital, requires, not only a "free" but an *elastic* working class. It necessitates the existence of a "reserve" army of workmen beside the active one, which it creates and augments by the repeated displacements of live-labor by machinery, and which it uses for the purposes of expansion when accumulation glides along smoothly until the next "fitful" explosion. The greater the accumulation of capital, the greater the "reserve" army which it needs and creates, as compared with the "active" army of workmen. The "reserve" army is not identical with the "army of the unemployed," but the greater the "reserve" the greater the potential army of the unemployed.

The workmen under capitalism being "free" and equal, there is no actual line of division between the active and reserve army of workmen. On the contrary they are in continual flux, men on duty and reservists continually changing place, and the same men sometimes being half active and half reserve. The existence of the reserve army and this relation between the active and reserve armies of the working class have the most deplorable effect on wages, and on the condition of the working class generally. Aside from the destitution caused by the introduction of new machinery among those workmen who are thereby thrown out of employment and those directly dependent on them, the presence in the market of this superfluous mass of labor-power entering into competition with that part of the working class which does find employment, reduces the price of that labor-power which is employed without thereby gaining any employment for itself. While the value of labor-power is determined by the amount of labor necessary for its re-production, that is, the amount of necessities consumed by the workmen, this amount is by no means a fixed quantity. It depends on the standard of life of the working class as it has developed in the course of its historical existence in a given country. But this standard, being a product of historical forces, may be raised or lowered. The existence of the "reserve" army, the process of the accumulation of capital which produced it, tends to lower this standard and it needs a lot of fighting to keep it up, not to speak of raising it. Besides, making, as it does the workman the sport of every turn of the fortunes of capitalistic production, and absolutely insecure in whatever livelihood he does get by reason of the fierce competition of his fellow-workers, and therefore dependent on the whim and caprice of his capitalist employer, it tends to degrade his morale, break in him all mani-

festations of the spirit of independence, and to make of him a servile tool of his capitalistic master.

But right here in its influence on its first requisite, a free working-class, we encounter the contradictory nature of capitalistic development. The very processes which tend to reduce the workingman's wages, and to lower and degrade him, bring into being those conditions which enable him to forge the weapons by which he cannot only successfully withstand the hurtful tendencies of capitalistic development, but which are destined to work the wonders of his salvation from wage-slavery,—*the economic and political organization of the working class*. The introduction of those very new machines which threw so many workingmen out of employment and so largely increased the "reserve" army, have laid the physical foundation for the organization of the working class by bringing great masses of workingmen together and by rubbing off all differences between them. It has also laid the mechanical foundation for the future greatness of the working class by changing the methods of production from their narrow individual foundation to a broad social base.

No less contradictory is the effect of the process of accumulation of capital in its effects on the capitalist class itself. As we have already seen, the accumulation of capital is accompanied by a falling rate of interest. This naturally tends to retard the progress of the process of accumulation, and works in the nature of an automatic brake. This, however, is not the only way in which the process of accumulation counteracts its own tendencies thereby checking the *tempo* of its growth. Every invention of a new machine, while an evidence of growing accumulation of capital, and itself a means to its increased accumulation, is at the same time the means of an enormous destruction of existing capital. As was already pointed out, our vast accumulations of wealth consist in aggregations of machinery. But every invention of a new machine makes the machine the place of which it is to take, useless, and the capital invested in such machines is therefore totally destroyed. The progress of accumulation of capital is therefore accompanied by enormous destruction of existing capital, which naturally retards the growth of the sum-total of capital. Besides, the invention of new machinery, by diminishing the time necessary for the production of commodities, and thereby lowering their values, lowers the value of *all* existing capital. This, again, has a tendency to retard the process of accumulation, the growth of the sum-total valuation of the machinery and other commodities of which the capital possessed by the capitalist class consists.

The capitalists as a class might regard with complacency these retarding tendencies or automatic checks in the accumula-

tion of capital, for the net-result of the contradictory tendencies is still a rapid enough growth of the accumulated mass of capital to suit even the most exacting of capitalists. But the complacency of the individual capitalists is disturbed by the details of the process which result from these contradictory tendencies, and by the way those details affect their individual fortunes.

For while the net result of the process, as far as the whole mass of capital is concerned, is a pretty rapid growth, this growth is not at all equally distributed among the different individual capitals. Quite to the contrary: the contradictions of the process manifest themselves largely by the extreme rapidity of the growth of some of the individual capitals, and the equally extreme rapidity of the shrinkage, or the total extinction, of some other individual capitals, due to the fact that the benefits derived and the losses incurred by reason of the contradictory elements of the process are not equally distributed among the individual capitalists. Under a system based on competition they could not very well be.

The general process of accumulation of capital, by reason of its mechanical basis alone, leads to the concentration of capital and production, that is to the formation of economic centers whereat are "run together" within comparatively small space and under one guidance large amounts of value in the shape of costly machinery and other means of production, and large numbers of workmen. And the particular way in which this process works its way, by benefiting some capitalists at the expense of others, leads to the centralization of capital, that is the amassing of large amounts of wealth in the same hands, by transferring the capital of those capitalists who lose by the process to those that come out winners. This leads to an increase in the number of large capitalists, whose capital grows at the expense of the general body of capitalists whose number constantly decreases. The chosen few capitalists fatten at the expense of their fellows.

These two processes—the concentration and the centralization of capital—accelerate each other. Particularly does the concentration of capital become a powerful factor in its centralization, by turning over into the control, and ultimate ownership, of the winners in the game whatever the losers manage to save from the wreckage, as well as the belongings of those who have managed to keep their wealth although they lost their economic position. By reason of the concentration of capital, those capitalists who have saved part of their capital, and even those who have managed to keep their capital intact, are unable to maintain their independence and continue in the economic process as independent operators. First, because by reason of the concentration of capital, that is to say, by reason of the fact that, owing to the introduction of improved machinery, a large

outlay of capital is necessary in order to carry on production on the new basis, the capital which formerly enabled a capitalist to operate independently is now insufficient for that purpose. So that even the capitalist who still possesses the amount of capital which he formerly possessed is unable to continue as an independent capitalist. And secondly, even if the amount possessed by such capitalists should be sufficient for the technical needs of the production-process on the new basis, such a capitalist would still be unable to maintain an independent existence for the reason that under the new circumstances, with the lower rate of profit which follows, his capital would not yield sufficient revenue to maintain him, and certainly not enough to permit him to further accumulate. This creates what might be called a "reserve" army of capitalists, or rather, half-way capitalists, whose capitals go to swell the funds of the real capitalists in the time of the expansion of economic activity, and these latter get most of the benefit derived therefrom. These supernumerary capitalists also usually furnish the funds for all sorts of crazy speculative ventures, which in their turn also accelerate the centralization of capital. This "between the devil and the deep sea" class is receiving constant accretions from above owing to the constant squeezing out process of the devil on top by the continued accumulation of capital, and its numbers are as constantly being depleted by its lower strata sinking into the deep sea of wage-slavery. If this process should be permitted freely to work out its tendencies, it would result in society being sharply divided into two unequal divisions: a few enormously rich capitalists on top, and the bulk of society at the bottom. A stage would be reached when by reason of lack of numbers, the capitalists would really cease to be a social class, as a social class presupposes a certain minimum of numbers, and the loss in quantity would turn, for the capitalists, into a loss of the quality of their position as a social class.

Will this process work out these tendencies? And what will be its effect on the future of the capitalist system? According to Marx these tendencies of the capitalist system must run their fatal course, unless the system itself breaks down before the process is at its end. For the contradictions of the law of value which is at the basis of the capitalist system of production and distribution are such that, aside from the sociological results enumerated by us to which they must inevitably lead, its purely economico-mechanical existence is put in jeopardy by the laws of its own development.

The purely economico-mechanical breakdown of the capitalist system will result, according to the Marxian theory, from the said inherent contradictions of the law of value, unless the development of capitalism is in some way arrested or unless the

system breaks down earlier for some other reason, in the following manner:

In the fight for the market among the individual capitalists under the rules laid down by the God Competition, each capitalist in order to survive and succeed must strive to be able to sell his goods cheaper than his competitors in the market, that is, he must be able to produce cheaper than the others so as to be able to undersell them and still make a profit. There are various ways in which the cost of production can be lowered. They all reduce themselves, however, to one proposition: to make the share of the workingman in the product produced by him as small as possible. This may be accomplished either by directly reducing the wages of the workingman, an expedient which cannot always be resorted to for the reason that there is a limit beyond which the wages of workingmen cannot be reduced. The more usual way, therefore, is the one which we have already noted, that is by continually substituting machinery in the place of live labor, by inventing labor-saving machinery. The result, as far as the relation of the workingman to the product produced by him, is the same in both cases: his share therein becomes smaller. It is the rising composition of capital which we have already observed.

There is, however, another phase to this process which is lost sight of by the individual capitalist, but which may have dire results for the capitalist class and the whole system. Beside the desired result of cheapening commodities this process has the very undesirable result of making the purchasing power of the laborer smaller in proportion. In other words, the laborer ceases to be as good a customer as he was before, and, as the capitalist must have a customer to buy his products, whether cheap or dear, and can not sell his products unless he has a customer ready and able to pay for his products, he is evidently placed in this dilemma,—either he must give his workingmen a larger share of the manufactured product in the shape of wages, or at least refrain from cutting down the share which the workingmen receive, or destroy the purchasing power of the workingmen, that is, of his future customers.

This contradiction grows and is enhanced in potentiality with the development of the capitalist system for the reason that the development of the capitalist system consists as we have seen, in this very cheapening of production by the supplanting of the workingman through labor-saving machinery. As the capitalist system develops, that portion of capital which goes to pay the workingman's wages diminishes very rapidly in comparison with the whole capital employed for the purposes of production. The result of this is, as we have seen, first, a falling rate of interest; and second, a growing army of unem-

ployed, a relative over-population. But the same law which creates a relative over-population, an over-production of men, also creates an increasing over-production of goods, as, the larger the army of the unemployed, the smaller the army of workingmen purchasers. This will finally result in the disproportion between that portion of the manufactured product which goes to the workingman and the whole of the yearly product of society becoming so great that the over-production, that is to say, that part of the manufactured product which will find no purchasers, will clog the wheels of production and bring the whole machinery of society to a stop.

The stock argument against this position of Marx is that while the immediate effect of the introduction of machinery is to throw out of employment the workingman employed in the branch of manufacture in which the new machines are introduced, it at the same time of itself opens up new employments. When sifted down, this amounts to the contention that the workingmen who are thrown out of employment in the old industry wherein the new machinery is introduced are re-employed in the machinery producing industry wherein these very machines are produced. This contention is, however, evidently untrue for the following reasons: As we have already seen, the reason for introducing a new or improved machine is a desire to cheapen the manufacture of a product. This cheapening can be effected only by saving labor, and this saving must be a very substantial one in order to make it profitable to the capitalist to introduce the new machinery, because this requires a large outlay of capital. Workingmen are usually paid by the week, so that the outlay in capital for the employment of a hundred workingmen will be the weekly wage of these one hundred workingmen. A new machine, however, which should dispense with the work of fifty of these one hundred men usually requires the expenditure of a large sum of money entirely out of proportion with the weekly allowance of the fifty workingmen whose labor is dispensed with. That is why modern capitalistic enterprise, require such large amounts of capital to properly carry them on. The new machine must therefore not only cost in original price and expenses of keeping less than it would cost to employ the fifty men during the time of service of this machine, but it must also pay sufficient to warrant the large investment of capital involved in its introduction. In other words, the labor-saving quality of the machine must be a very substantial one. A mere small saving of labor will not warrant the introduction of costly machinery, requiring, as it usually does, an entire change of the system of production and large expenditures not only in the buying of the machine itself but also in

its accommodation in buildings, etc., and involving as it does, the destruction of much old capital.

Now, if it were true that the workingmen who are thrown out of employment by this machine can be reemployed in the production of this very machine, that is to say, if it required as much labor to produce this machine as it was formerly required to produce the product which this machine is now to produce, there evidently will not only be no cheapening of production, but on the contrary, production will be more expensive because it will require the same expenditure of work or labor (for the machine and the product together), and a larger outlay of capital. Evidently, this machine must not require in its production the same amount or even nearly the same amount of labor which would be required to produce the products which it produces.

Of course, the same number of people may be employed in producing this machine, but this machine should produce a vastly larger amount of product than was ever before produced without it; but then, the question presents itself, — to whom shall this additional product be sold? The share of the workingman in this largely enhanced product must be much smaller in proportion to what his share was before the introduction of the new machinery, otherwise production will not have been made cheaper. There will, therefore, be a larger product to dispose of than there ever was before, and the difficulty of finding a customer becomes insuperable.

It may be argued that the additional product which the workingmen will be unable to buy up will be taken up by the capitalist. This seems a very simple way out of it, and sounds very plausible. As a matter of fact, for long centuries this is the way things usually adjusted themselves. Under the old slave and feudal systems there never was such a problem as over-production, for the reason that production being for home consumption, it was always a question of how much of the product produced shall be given to the slave or serf and how much of it should go to the slave-holder or feudal baron. When, however, the respective shares of the two classes was determined upon, each proceeded to consume his share without encountering any further trouble. In other words, the question always was, how the products should be divided, and there never was any question of over-production for the reason that the product was not to be sold in the market but was to be consumed by the persons immediately concerned in its production either as master or slave. There was no production for the market, and consequently no overstocking of the market. When, by chance, production increased out of all proportion, the product could

simply be stored away, and it never interfered with the proper prosecution of the industries of the future.

Not so, however, in our modern capitalistic industry. It is true that all of the product with the exception of that portion which goes to the workingman goes, now as before, to the master, now the capitalist. This, however, does not settle the matter finally, for the reason that the capitalist does not produce for himself but for the market. He does not want the things that the workingman produced, but he wants to sell them, and unless he is able to sell them they are absolutely of no use to him. Salable goods in the hands of the capitalists are his fortune, his capital, but when these goods become unsalable they are worthless, and his whole fortune contained in the stores of goods which he keeps melts away the moment the goods cease to be marketable.

Who then, will buy the goods from our capitalists who introduced new machinery into their production, thereby largely increasing their output? Of course, there are other capitalists who may want these things, but when the production of society as a whole is taken, what is the capitalist class going to do with the increased output which can not be taken up by the workingman? The capitalists themselves can not use them, either by each keeping his own manufactures or by buying them from each other. And for a very simple reason. The capitalist class can not itself use up all the surplus products which its workmen produce and which they take to themselves as their profits of production. This is already excluded by the very premise of capitalistic production on a large scale, and the accumulation of capital. Capitalistic production on a large scale implies the existence of large amounts of crystallized labor in the shape of great railroads, steamships, factories, machinery and other such manufactured products which have not been consumed by the capitalists to whom they have fallen as their share or profit in the production of former years. As was already stated before all the great fortunes of our modern capitalist kings, princes, barons and other dignitaries of industry, titled and untitled, consist of tools and machinery in one form or another, that is to say, in an unconsumable form. It is that share of the capitalist profits which the capitalists have "saved," and therefore left unconsumed. If the capitalists would consume all their profits there would be no capitalists in the modern sense of the word, there would be no accumulation of capital. In order that capital should accumulate the capitalist must not, under any circumstances, consume all his profits. The capitalist who does, ceases to be a capitalist and goes under in the competition with his fellow capitalists. In other words, modern capitalism presupposes the saving habit of capitalists, that is

to say, that part of the profits of the individual capitalists must not be consumed but saved in order to increase the already existing capital.

As a matter of fact, this saving habit, of which the apologists of capitalism make such a virtue, is really enforced upon the capitalists. It is a *sine qua non* of capitalism itself. The very statement that improved machinery has been introduced in any industry already implies the fact that the capitalists of that industry have "saved" enough out of their share of the product manufactured by the old modes of production to be able to manufacture the new machinery or buy it from its manufacturers, and thereby increase the capital employed in their business. The same reason for "saving" which existed before the introduction of the new and improved machinery and which caused its introduction, namely, the competition of the market, which compels each capitalist to accumulate capital out of his profits, continues to exist and cause the further accumulation of capital and the further introduction of new and improved machinery. He cannot, therefore, consume all of his share in the manufactured product. It is evident, therefore, that neither the workman nor the capitalist can consume the whole of the increased product of manufacture? Who then, will buy it up?

H. B. BOUDIN.

(*To be continued.*)

A Peculiar Scientist.

THE articles signed Charles H. Chase in the January and February numbers of the REVIEW are rather too remarkable to pass unanswered.

It has been said — and I believe it is partly true — that the Socialist movement is woefully lacking in a sense of humor. To be sure, the sordid ugliness of proletarian life under capitalism is not very conducive to mirth. Be this as it may, what we lack in conscious humor is fortunately made up by a few unconscious humorists that we occasionally meet on our path.

When Cervantes' dashing hero — the immortal prototype of all unconscious humorists — made his famous charge against the windmill, he found out a few things. He found, for instance, that his lance was not quite stout enough. Before the attack, undoubtedly, he thought differently.

The materialist monism of the Socialist philosophy is based on modern science. Overthrow the latter, and the proletarian structure will fall.

Bold knights have ventured to try, and the arena is littered with broken lances, shattered shields, split buckles, and other smashed up paraphernalia.

Let us examine the latest attempt in this line. I do not care, for the present, to discuss the difference between modern science and the philosophy based on it; a difference about which Charles H. Chase seems to be ignorant. I will only criticize his science, which he is pleased to call "materialism."

To begin with, he states that "Dalton's theory of atoms is so crude and irrational that it has been abandoned by all scientists, except as to its convenience as a working hypothesis, without the possibility of its having any elements of truth in it." Indeed! And still the entire science of modern chemistry is based on just Dalton's theory of atoms. Very few chemists of to-day would dream of questioning the conception of the atom? To be sure the atom idea, like everything else, has had its growth and development corresponding to the increased knowledge of facts. And to-day it is stronger than ever. I know it is a trick the metaphysical mind often plays on itself to consider a thing out of its historical and evolutionary connection. I suppose the derivation of the word "atom" — indivisible — given by Dalton for convenience' sake, because at the time there seemed to be no means to split further the atom by

chemical or other means. I suppose this derivation of a word (and the associations it will bring in his brain) is the particular nail the metaphysician uses in this case to hang himself on. He hangs nothing else.

The belief that the chemical atom is composed of some smaller unit (or units)—not necessarily hydrogen—entertained by practically all chemists of note since the atom idea was first conceived seems to be justified in these latter days by the results derived from the study of the radio-active substances, to say nothing of the spectroscopic results of Lockyer, Rydberg, and others. These discoveries have not destroyed the atomic theory but on the contrary enriched and developed it.

Finally, let me add that Dalton's theory of atoms never pretended to explain gravitation, nor molecular, nor even chemical attractions, and consequently cannot be said to utterly fail to give us a rational theory of the constitution of matter.

The speculations by Mr. Chase regarding what he calls the Ionization theory of matter must be passed on for the present until he explains what he means by it, if indeed, he means anything. There is an "ionization" theory of solutions, but not of matter, except possibly in that rich and peculiar literature called newspaper science. Or may be he means the corpuscular theory? Who knows?

After having pointed out the contradiction between the properties required for the æther by the theory of vortex atoms and by the theory of light—a real difficulty, which, however, will soon be solved—and having made the statement—though unsupported by any fact in the discussion headed by it—that "materialistic conceptions cannot be harmonized with facts," Mr. Chase proceeds to use his heavy artillery. He has discovered what he calls "A Paradox of Physics and Mechanics." Shades of Galilei and Newton! Ghosts of Helmholtz and Clark Maxwell! Spooks of Boyle and Gay-Lussac and Avogadro! Come out from your retreat in the "spiritual" world, read the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for January, 1906, and learn what arrant frauds you are!

If any of the gentlemen mentioned would happen to come back to find out what was the row, I imagine he would first ask to know the charge against them. They would read it, and then proceed to emit as hearty a laugh as spirits may indulge in without losing their decorum.

Mr. Chase has discovered an awful contradiction between the preservation of energy and what he calls the preservation of motion. Let us analyze the case he brings up. Two balls of unit mass. One in motion with the velocity of two, the other at rest. Let them collide so that the first one delivers one half of its motion to the other. Without further analysis he pro-

ceeds, "The momentum before the collision is two, and the energy also two. After collision the motion is two, but the energy one unit only. Query: What has become of the unit of energy which has disappeared?

In all humility I wish to state that the brick I am going to heave is so easy to let go that I do not claim the least credit for it.

Mr. Chase, the only way by which a ball such as you assume, can impart half of its motion to the other ball previously at rest is to strike it so that the second ball will move in a direction deviating forty-five degrees from the original direction of motion of the first ball. The two balls after the impact will move in directions having an angle of ninety degrees between them, each with a velocity equal to the square root of two. Figure out the total energy before and after the impact, assuming that no energy has been lost in vibrations. You will find it to be two in both cases. Also figure out the component of velocity of the first ball along the impact line. This component is the square root of two. After the impact it all has been delivered up to the second ball. Where is the loss of motion along that line? There is none. The whole trouble comes from the fact that Mr. Chase does not know the nature of that law he is talking about. It is simply this: The sum of the quantities of motion *parallel to any fixed direction*, of two rigid bodies influencing one another in any possible way, remains unchanged by their mutual action.

For instance, this sum before the collision along the original line of direction of the first ball is two, and after the collision the sum of the quantities of motion parallel to that line is again two.

I might add that the assumption he makes of a gas in which all molecules but one are at rest is a contradiction in terms—the molecules of a *gas* are never at rest—and give him a lengthy and fully satisfactory explanation of the "paradox" he has conjured up, but lack of space forbids. I believe, also, that no more discussion is needed regarding this strange vagary of Mr. Chase.

Instead let us proceed. On page 408 Mr. Chase complains that "materialistic philosophers have eliminated all such notions as force..." and on the next page he asks us to explain the nature of potential energy. Why, as soon as any force has been explained as derived from motion, the corresponding kind of potential energy—that being merely a product of force and distance—has then proved to be derived from actual energy. In Newton's time we had a great and varied collection of forces, many of which are now explained as functions of motion. This does not necessarily mean that the idea of force has

been abandoned. It merely implies that it has been brought into synthetic connection with the more fundamental idea of motion. For instance, nobody hesitates to talk about and figure with such a thing as the pressure of a gas merely because it has been demonstrated that this pressure is derived from the *vis viva* of the molecules.

As soon as the nature of the force of gravitation is known the "mystery" of the potential energy of the stone Mr. Chase talks about, will be solved just as the one time "mystery" of the potential energy of a compressed gas already is explained.

On page 410 Mr. Chase admits that the theory of LeSage combined with that of vortex atoms might possibly explain "gravity" and the transmission of radiant energy. "But for chemism and other molecular and interatomic forces it is entirely powerless to afford an explanation." Is Mr. Chase ignorant of the reason that brought both Helmholtz and William Thomson to develop the theory of vortex atoms? In both cases those men of tremendous intellect decided to try if they could not find an explanation for chemical and molecular attractions. Incidentally, they had to show that a vortex ring theory would not conflict with other facts of science, such as gravitation and transmission of light. They did not explain the nature of chemical force but they blazed the trail for some distance in the right direction.

Mr. Chase finishes the January installment with a ludicrous speculation on the atomic weights that certainly needs no comment whatever. Still I might point out that if the atoms are made up of smaller units, which most chemists of to-day believe, how could there possibly be a continuous series of atomic weights, I might add that lead is not the element with the highest known atomic weight of 206.4, as Mr. Chase seems to think. Bismuth has 208.5, thorium 232, and uranium 240. But such things are trifles.

Before I leave the January installment I wish to quote the following passage from page 411.

"Many other questions, quite as pertinent, to be drawn from the chemical and physical properties of matter bring forth no answer from the materialist; they can have no answer but in the assumption of an intelligent Creator, or the assumption of *one Infinite Intelligence and Power of which all other intelligences and powers are individualized fragments.*"

I will now proceed to put the above quotation in juxtaposition to the following one from the February number, page 463.

"We cannot conceive of the union of a number of mental units to form another mental unit. The same difficulty arises in conceiving the human mind and consciousness as made up of

lesser mental units and consciousnesses, as we find in conceiving a separate and higher consciousness of a body of individuals."

Query: Can one "intelligence" be composed of many smaller "intelligences," while one "consciousness" can not be composed of many smaller "consciousnesses." If so, why?

In the February number Mr. Chase touches on the question of the dissipation of energy. His conclusions are mainly correct. It seems to me, however, that this difficulty, for many years a real one, has finally been overcome by the latest discoveries about radium. In the breaking up of the atom, energy of high potentiality is formed from energy of low potentiality. This, however, has connection with a theory on the evolution of matter which I am going to publish in the future, and must be left for the present.

Mr. Chase explains this formation of energy of high potentiality by "life so overruling and directing the chemical forces that they form compounds such as are never formed in the absence of life." He makes the (as yet) true statement that all of our organic chemistry in the laboratory is confined to tearing down organic cells, the building up of a single cell has never been effected except through the agency of life.

To begin with, I wish to point out to Mr. Chase that the radiant energy of the sun is of very high potentiality, and gives a perfectly satisfactory explanation whence comes the energy to dissociate the carbon dioxide, and build up the plant.

In answer to his statement regarding our failure to produce life from unorganized matter in the laboratory—for that is what it amounts to, "building up a cell," as he calls it—it is but necessary to point to the history of organic chemistry, from Wöhler's production of urea in 1828 to Fischer's sugar syntheses in these latter days and say like this: True, we do not know everything as yet, but the achievements of the past and the work of the present are pregnant with promise for the future. We are not going to quit just yet. We shall not sit down and do nothing.

For indeed, it is doing nothing or worse, it is a mental *and moral* declaration of bankruptcy to weakly turn back to the mystic and so-called idealistic halfway stations of the past. God and the whole collection of "spirits" are simply those things we don't know. In the past we planted a god in every nook and corner not yet explored by us. In the sky we put our gods. As we began to know about those various places we removed our gods from there. No longer is Thor chattering around in the heavens heaving his hammer at the giants. The picturesque gentleman is removed from there because we know that thunder and lightning are electric phenomena. The God of the time of

Reformation was a different God to the emasculated abstraction that serves the "religious" purposes of to-day. With our gods we have also left behind us some of the "spiritual" notions of bygone days.

To-day the time is ripe for the greatest generalization yet made by man. Atomic and molecular forces, electricity and light and gravitation all those phenomena will be brought together into one great synthesis, and the forward step thus taken by the human mind will leave far behind some of the intellectual odds and ends that we are now burdening ourselves with. Materialist monism is the philosophy born by the struggles between the old ideas and the new and growing and coming generalization, it is the philosophical form of the Revolution of the Ages.

I might stop here, but I cannot help making an observation in regard to that dear old doctrine of the free will so petted by the metaphysicians, a doctrine, by the way, on which may be raised and have been raised some elegant structures defending political and economic tyranny.

The serious objection is made by many longfaced gentlemen that if this doctrine be destroyed all morality will disappear. I answer: What of it, I have no property to worry about, and all our present morality is a property morality.

Undoubtedly here is a point overlooked by so many of our most well meaning philosophers. Their metaphysical training also makes them ask us strange questions. They ask the revolutionary proletarian, they honestly and sincerely ask: If Socialism will come any way, what is the use of you hustling so to make it come? Why do you exert yourself?

The proletaire will answer, "My dear sir, I am sitting on a tack, and I am trying to get off." The metaphysical gentleman may not be able to see the point. The proletarian, however, can understand the point, because he can feel it.

But I have already departed from my original plan. My intention was to criticize the science of Mr. Chase, not his philosophy. This I have to leave to some philosophy sharp. The movement has some middling fair ones. Comrade Unter-mann, please step in, and attend to Mr. Chase.

HJALMAR WESTLING.

Materialism in its Relation to Socialism and Progress.

III.

DETERMINISM AN INEVITABLE CONCLUSION OF MATERIALISM.

WITH all the variations of materialistic philosophy as to its fundamental assumptions, there seems now to be a unanimity as to the statement that all phenomena are in their last analysis but matter, ether, and motion. And by no circumlocution of language or jugglery of reasoning can such a philosophy result in anything but the most rigid determinism. We start with fortuitous pushes and stresses of the assumed matter and ether. These by chance differentiation are resolved into rhythmic motion and vibration. By chance combinations of various particles having a variety of motions, more and more complexities arise. As certain degrees of complexity are attained, we have sound, heat, light, electricity, life, mind, and rational thought in an ascending series. But all these phenomena occur in accordance with certain laws of attraction and repulsion of the particles of matter. Any system of particles unaffected by forces outside the system, can only change from one configuration to another in ever recurring cycles, or repetitions. By the operation of its own internal forces and by the action of incident forces from without, are the only ways in which a system can be changed in configuration. Now any change effected in either of these ways is in accordance with the fixed and unalterable laws of mechanics, and can have but one resultant. There can be no possible deviation from the motion determined by the eternal laws of matter. The human individual is as fixed and predetermined in his action as any mechanism. He who strikes the murderous blow is driven by the same inevitable laws of matter as is the locomotive, which goes as cheerfully into the open draw-bridge as over a smooth track.

NO COMPROMISE BETWEEN DETERMINISM AND LIBERTARIANISM.

Many materialists attempt to evade this conclusion by giving place for a little freedom—freedom between certain limitations. But such compromisers, while unaware of the complete surrender involved in their admission, do, in fact, give up the whole con-

tention. The most ultra free-will advocates contend for free will only under limitations; to remove limitations would be to make the individual omnipotent, an attribute impossible, except it may be to God himself. All finite beings must be limited, though one may move between narrow limits and another between much wider ones. But the moment the slightest choice is introduced into the organism, that moment a superior being is created,—as superior to the passive stone or machine as order is to chaos. The more logical of the materialists see this dilemma, and that there is no compromise, no half-way, or neutral ground, between determinism and free will. They accept determinism with all its consequences. Note the recent utterance of Hugh O. Pentecost, formerly a popular New York clergyman, in an address before the "Sunrise Club" of that city:

"I tried in my youth to read and understand the philosophers and metaphysicians. I gave it up. It was too hard for me. Then I settled it all for myself. Right and wrong, good and bad, moral and immoral, ought and ought not, have no meaning for me. The happiest moment of my life was when I found I'd eliminated my conscience, root and branch, and had no moral sense whatever.

"I got there by this process. I went back to nature. I found that one single principle exists in the universe—seeking the line of least resistance. We simply do always the thing which it is easiest to do under given circumstances.

"Good and evil are all gammon and spinach to me. From the martyr at the stake to the most abject criminal on the gallows, we are all doing the things we do because it is impossible for us to do anything else.

"If you'd get rid of conscience and all that tommyrot, you'd have the solution to every problem in life. I've no fear of God or the devil. I have no desire to go to heaven and no dread of going to hell. Every temptation I have in the world I yield to—every one. And I'm not a bit different from all of you. I haven't any higher nature at all—nor any lower nature. I propose to yield to every temptation. I only have to be sure it is a temptation. If it is—good-bye, I'm gone.

"If I wanted to get drunk, I'd get drunk. If I wanted to beat my wife, I'd beat her. If I don't, it is because I'd rather not. It's more comfortable. Shall I blame another man who drinks and beats his wife because it gives him joy?

"Character? There's no such thing as character. Those persons have good character to me who have those desires which I consider beautiful desires and act on them."

DETERMINISM IN ITS RELATION TO ETHICS AND PROGRESS.

Mr. Pentecost puts somewhat bluntly what is the logical and inevitable ethics of materialism. But he should go further; it was certainly a great waste of energy to enlighten his hearers of the Sunset Club, since all of their acts were determined before and he could in no way affect their action. Or, to put it in another light, if he was one of the predetermined forces to affect and guide the action of his hearers, then he went impelled by forces which he could not resist, and which move him about as passively as a feather on the crest of an ocean wave. But imagine anyone dictating to Mr. Pentecost, or even foretelling what he will do, then we would surely discover whether he has any volition or power of choice. Any fool can say after a fact or act, that it was caused by certain forces; and *a posteriori* arguments seem to be the stock in trade of determinists. And certainly, if Mr. Pentecost or any other man actually believed in determinism, he would be content to float passively down the stream of time with no care for, and no effort to change, his own condition or the inevitable flow of events. He would seek the easiest possible place, the balmy air, the most exquisite pleasures of sense and mind, and let the world wag as it will. All effort is folly and self-gratification the only good thing. In the light (or darkness rather) of such a philosophy there is no meaning to the world; love and hate, joy and despair, life and death are but unmeaning and fortuitous accidents amid the clash of atoms and the crash of worlds. Convince the world of the truth of this philosophy, then will there be an end of all progress and all civilization—nay, the life of the lowest beast will be better than man's; for the beast is conscious of choice and exercises it.

NO REAL BELIEVERS IN DETERMINISM.

But the fact is that no man believes in determinism; his every conscious act gives such unreason the lie. There is no fact of consciousness, no bit of knowledge brought home with more convincing force than this; that when two or more possible alternatives are placed before an individual, he is able to choose one of them to the exclusion of the others; and that, when he has made a choice, he is conscious that he might have made a different one. It is only when a philosopher finds that his philosophy has landed him in the quagmire of absurdity and contradiction that he has recourse to that capsheaf of all absurdities, determinism.

That the so-called scientific socialism should be placed on so lame and irrational a philosophy is one of the idiosyncrasies of the human mind; and that socialism should deify a philosophy

which, could it be galvanized into life and made general in belief, would be the destroyer of the cause of socialism, is quite incomprehensible.

ALTERNATIVE PHILOSOPHIES.

The materialist, however, answers our objections to his philosophy by objecting to ours, whatever it may be. It is not my intention here to enter upon any extended defence of alternative philosophies; but it will not be amiss to show briefly the status of dualism, idealism, and theism in the general belief of mankind.

Dualism, which may be designated as the old fashioned, common sense belief of mankind, held by most men since the dawn of history, in one form or another, but which we are accustomed to refer to Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, still commands the belief of the great majority of the civilized peoples of the earth, if not, even, of the uncivilized peoples. It encounters the same difficulties, in attempting to give a satisfactory explanation of the ultimate constitution of matter, as does materialism. It makes, also, in addition to the assumption of matter, the assumption of spirit, equally difficult to explain, and the substance of which eludes our senses as completely as does the ether of present day science. But once admit its fundamental assumptions, it is able to explain both the mental and so-called physical phenomena, encountering but few of the difficulties that beset materialism at every step. It goes hand in hand with interactionism and theism as correlative and supplementary philosophies.

Idealism, while a much younger philosophy than dualism, and generally dated back only to the time of Kant, though some of the ancients had much in common with it, is a philosophy which encounters few, if any, of the difficulties of either materialism or dualism. It assumes only our conscious self and ideas (sensations, perceptions, and thought) for which we have the best data of cognition of any in the whole realm of knowledge. The so-called external or material world is symbolized only to the mind through the media of the senses, and the existence of the material in the sense of the non-mental is denied, or, at least, ignored as being beyond the realm of our knowledge. The permanency of certain symbols, however, under similar conditions of mind, seem to argue for something substantial and material in the world with which we come in contact. But psychophysical idealism, which attributes mind to every material thing and phenomenon, knowledge of which reaches the mind through the senses, and explains all phenomena as a contact of the mental with the mental, apparently, at least, gets over the difficulties commonly urged against idealism. Yet so convincing are our

senses, and so accustomed are we to put absolute trust in the report of our senses to our minds that it is with difficulty the student of philosophy can educate himself to the belief that the symbolism of the senses is of an ideal world and not of a material one. There is, however, no more difficulty in this than in our educating ourselves to the belief that the earth is round and rotates on its axis, instead of a flat, immovable body with the heavens rotating about it. Indeed, all of the more abstruse propositions of modern science involve quite as much difficulty in belief as the propositions of idealism. Yet, doubtless, because of its apparent opposition to the empirical facts of science, and common sense as well, it has no wide-spread belief among the masses. But this must be said of it, that, with the simple assumption of consciousness, which all must admit or deny all criteria of knowledge, idealism meets with the fewest difficulties of any fundamental philosophy yet propounded. I must, therefore, contend, in view of all these facts, that the fight for supremacy in the philosophical world will be between the forces of dualism and idealism, with materialism *hors de combat*.

Again, the correlative philosophy of materialism is atheism, while the correlative of dualism and idealism is the philosophy of theism. By theism I do not mean the crude anthropomorphism held to by uneducated religionists; that has been handed down to us from our superstitious forefathers, and is rapidly disappearing before the better reason and scientific light of modern times. By theism I do mean the belief in a God immanent in nature, guiding and controlling all with infinite wisdom, power, and fixity of purpose. The teleological idea is everywhere; we cannot escape the obtruding design in everything in nature to which we give our careful thought and study. With all the efforts put forth by materialists to create an orderly universe by the automatic action of brute atoms, they are as unefficacious as a stone-heap to build itself into a beautiful and commodious residence. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*; and we may also say with equal force: *Ex chao ordo non fit*.

NO PHILOSOPHY YET PROPOUNDED CAN EXPLAIN ALL.

It is not to be expected that man will ever be able to fathom all the mysteries of Nature and Mind; yet his progressive spirit is such that he will always struggle to square all phenomena by the criteria of reason. The positivists ignore these criteria when they refuse to consider cause and satisfy themselves with sequence merely. And a more serious error is that which may be characterized as the dogmatism of science, often dignified by the term, "scientific method." This "method" rejects all that

the investigator does not understand, and refuses to look beyond phenomena for any "metaphysical" reasons.

That which involves irreconcilable facts, difficulties, and absurdities must be erroneous in some particular; and when we run against such facts, difficulties, and absurdities in our theorizing we must revise our theories. By this method have all accepted theories of knowledge been evolved. But a theory should not be rejected because of difficulties, since the theory may be so modified as to remove or evade the difficulties. The Copernican System of astronomy and the Nebular Hypothesis have suffered great changes from the form in which they were originally propounded; and a theory which is yet in a very unsettled state as to fundamentals and details is the Theory of Evolution. Most educated people are now evolutionists; but there is the widest variation in belief among evolutionists.

These brief comments on other philosophies are really outside the questions at issue; and they have been made merely to give the reader an idea of the philosophies opposed to materialism and their present status. Far be it from me to say that they can give a rational, complete, and satisfactory explanation of all phenomena; but I would say, merely, that they are infinitely more satisfactory to the demands of reason, design, and progress than is materialism. And here I rest my case until I have heard the arguments of my opponents.

CHAS. H. CHASE.

Resignation of Joseph M. Patterson.*

It was through a common belief in the cause of Municipal Ownership of municipal utilities that I first became acquainted with you and in this letter of resignation I desire publicly to express how my views on this subject have changed. They have not diminished. They have enlarged. I used to believe that many of the ills under which the nation suffers and by which it is threatened would be prevented or avoided by the general inauguration of the policy of Public Ownership of public utilities. But my experience in the Department of Public Works has convinced me that this policy would be not even one-fourth of the way sufficient.

Take the case of Great Britain where municipal trading has been developed to a high and successful degree. The problem of the unemployed there is becoming one of tremendous and sad intensity. The evils of capitalism are, as far as one can judge of them, hardly affected by municipal trading.

Take the case of Germany where government ownership of railroads has been inaugurated and the municipal ownership of public utilities is paramount. In that Empire, the rich continue to grow richer and the poor to grow poorer with an acceleration hardly less than that so evident in the United States.

Since you have been inaugurated as Mayor of Chicago, you have sought and in spite of the sneers and opposition of your critics, you have sought most successfully to further the cause of Municipal Ownership and I have in a far minor way, since my induction in the office to which you appointed me, sought to diminish the amount of special privileges in our City. Of thousands of instances which I might cite, let me respectfully suggest that you draw your own conclusions from the following two or three: The Illinois Tunnel Company, operating under a franchise from the city which provides that its conduit shall always remain twenty-seven feet below city datum, have sought continuously to evade that franchise provision. You may remember that last December it applied in most cryptic terms for a permit to run its cars up practically to the surface at the Canal Street Depot. This application was refused, again made and again refused. Thereupon the Tunnel Company sought to steal in the connection early one Sunday morning. They were caught and stopped. Within a week

*) We have omitted the opening paragraphs of the letter dealing with the details of administration of his work and suggestions for his successor. See editorial department.

they made the same attempt again and were again stopped. This time their employees were arrested. Of course the fault lay not with the employees but with the officers of the Corporation. I inquired of the State's Attorney of Cook County whether the officers of the corporation could not be imprisoned for their offense, viz. the attempted stealing of the street. I brought forward the fact in my inquiry that it would be easy enough to imprison a man for stealing a loaf of bread; but an examination of the statutes showed that there was no penal offense and that nothing could be done.

Another well-known instance is that of the Illinois Steel Company which had filled in Lake Michigan land worth between five and ten million dollars. This land so filled in belonged to the people of the state of Illinois. About this there is no question that our laws and our legal machinery are so framed that recovery is impossible save at the end of a long lawsuit and even then it is most doubtful. The lawsuit has been initiated. If corruption is not meanwhile successful, the suit will drag on for at least four or five years. You and I both know that at the end of that time it is exceedingly improbable that the State of Illinois will recover much from the Illinois Steel corporation, because the land so filled in has been covered with factories, docks, slips, etc., which conduce to capitalistic activity. To interfere with them would "interfere with business," which cannot really be done.

In the downtown department of the City of Chicago, there are hundreds of bay-windows projecting beyond the building line. These bay-windows may have been put there by virtue of a Council order or ordinance, in which case the Council order or ordinance was unconstitutional. But practically none of these bay-windows have been removed. All that we have been able to do is to charge a very moderate rate of compensation. The compensation so collected has been illegal because laws do not permit of the alienation of part of the sidewalk. However, we sought to collect this compensation because we thought it was better than nothing.

And the sincere resistance accorded us has been amazing. One would suppose that a set of incendiaries, anarchists, communists and all the other "ists" which are the terms of greatest reproach in our language had sought constantly to destroy the interests of our community. It never occurred to the owners that they were getting something for nothing. They simply realized that they were making money by having the bay-windows and paying nothing for them, and therefore nothing else mattered to them.

The Department has several times caught water thieves. It

has on examination of a meter found that its mechanism had been so altered as to register but one-fifth of all the water which passed through the meter. But application to the State's Attorney evolved the fact that our present laws—framed in the interests of capital—practically make it no offense for capital (i. e. the privileged few) to steal from the community, (i. e. the unprivileged many). Consequently, nothing could be done to the water thieves.

Again and again we ran up against the injunction business. A particular collection of capital (a firm, corporation or rich individual) would steal something from the community—for instance, valuable land. When we tried to dispossess capital—injunction. And capital would hold the land or other valuable asset of the community during the pendency of a long and troublesome lawsuit.

The whole body of our laws as at present framed are ridiculous and obsolete. They are designed always to uphold capital at the expense of the community. The most potent weapon in the armory of capital is Delay—for Delay induces forgetfulness of the wrong and the chance to corrupt.

Money is so strong now-adays that, given time, Delay, it can in some form or other corrupt most men or if it cannot do that, it can get the crank out of the way.

I realized soon after I took office that to fight privilege under the present laws would be a jest. The cards were stacked in its favor from the start; the dice were loaded and are loaded against the community.

Hence of the insignificant little bit that I accomplished against privilege, not one tithe of a tithe could have been accomplished through the law. What I succeeded in was practically all done in an extra legal (though I think never an illegal) way. To enforce obedience on the part of capital even to the existing laws—and we all know the existing laws are “fair” enough to capital—I was compelled to hold up permits, to use force, to pester, worry and annoy, in ways never contemplated by our present laws. It would not surprise me if such a system of hazing as I was forced much against my will to adopt were now to be made a criminal offense by the next legislature.

It isn't because rich men are bad or a class apart. They are not. But when money possesses them (they practically never possess money) it alters their very souls without their realizing it and it is simple to see why. It is because money is what a man most wants. It is the very dearest wish of his heart, whatever that may be.

Money is power and dominion. It is wine and woman and song. It is art and poetry and music. It is idleness and activity.

It is warmth in winter and coolness in summer. It is clothing and food. It is travel and sport. It is horses and automobiles and silks and diamonds. It is books. It is education. It is self respect and the respect of all others.

No one possesses it but it possesses everybody. In life, money means everything, and therefore, anybody will do anything to get it. It enslaves those whom it possesses and it likewise enslaves in a more sordid way those who have none of it. The man who has money masters the destinies of those who have it not.

Here is an instance as it seems to me entirely significant: In the Civil War, an eminent Philadelphia financier by the name of Jay Cooke lent a considerable sum of money at a low rate of interest, (perhaps at no interest at all; I have forgotten) to the government. His name has come down in this country as a patriot of extraordinary purity, a man who, when the country was in need, was willing to sacrifice a large part (perhaps the whole, I have forgotten) of his fortune to its welfare. His example was so unique that the average history of that time has never been able to get over it.

During the same time, over a million men enlisted and went to the front. They offered not their money but their lives, their blood and their families to the cause in which they believed and no one has deemed them extraordinary; whereas Jay Cooke was extraordinary, because he did not wring out every cent he could from the necessities of the nation. In other words, it is infinitely more uncommon to risk money than to risk blood.

This example, I believe, shows how much stronger money is than man. A man is expected to risk his life but he is hardly expected to risk his fortune. He would give away money before he would give away life, because if he were to die he would have no money anyway. But he would, and he does seriously, risk life for the sake of money.

I cannot, therefore, see why money, which is the greatest thing in life, should not be more or less evenly distributed, just as the ballot is.

The universal ballot gives every male citizen an equal political opportunity. The common ownership of all the means of production and distribution would give everybody an equal chance at music, art, power, sport, study, recreation, travel, self respect and the respect of others. I for one cannot see why those things should be concentrated more and more in the hands of a few. Two hundred years ago a proposition for equal political opportunity would have seemed more absurd than to-day seems the proposition for equal opportunity in all things on this earth for which men strive.

Capital says that to-day there is equal opportunity for all. In this capital lies, and knows it.

By distributing money evenly, I do not mean to say that all the money in the country should be cut up into equal bits and that everybody should get a bit of it. But, on the contrary, I believe that the ownership from which money springs should be vested in the whole community. In other words, as I understand it, I am a Socialist. I have hardly read a book on socialism, but that which I have enunciated I believe in general to be their theory. If it is their theory I am a Socialist. You will find, and other advanced liberals and radicals who believe as you do will also find, that you are merely bartering with skin-deep measures when you stop short of socialism.

I beg your pardon for having so long trespassed on your time, and I wish you all the good fortune in the world.

Believe me, my dear Mr. Mayor, with the best regards,

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) JOSEPH M. PATTERSON.

EDITORIAL

Conspiracy to Murder.

Every reader of the REVIEW is doubtless familiar with the newspaper reports concerning the latest outrage against the Western Federation of Miners. On the 19th of last month Comrades William D. Haywood, Charles H. Moyer and several other officials of the Federation of Miners were arrested with secret extradition papers, and without opportunity to see their families or consult attorneys were hurried into a special train and rushed away to Idaho. Next the papers began to be full of an alleged confession by one, Harry Orchard. Just who this precious individual is some of our readers may not be aware. He is the spy to whose house the blood hounds went after the Independence explosion. At the time this took place, the capitalist press all denied or suppressed the facts and he was not arrested or in any way interfered with. Now, however, they are printing the story which they then denied only with the slight change, that they now allege that he was in the employ of the Western Federation of Miners. Then comes a grotesque story of a conspiracy in which the conspirators buried bombs, revolvers, rifles and other paraphernalia of assassination in various parts of the state of Idaho where they could be found by the police in accordance with a pre-arranged "confession."

Next comes the wife of this alleged spy who swears that he died in Death Valley six weeks before the date on which it is claimed he made the confession. Then the officials of the penitentiary where it is claimed he is confined give out word that he is dying of pneumonia or consumption and can not be expected to live until the trial. Meantime we are assured, however, that the confession which it is claimed consists of from seven hundred to one thousand pages (according to the power of imagination of the man who seems to be telling the story) is ready for presentation to the court. Under these conditions we are not surprised that the prosecuting attorney of Idaho has announced that unless some of the talking is stopped he will drop the whole case. Were it not for the terrible fact that the lives of these men were at stake the whole thing would remind one of comic opera.

There is not the slightest doubt, however, that this is all part of a

deliberate plot to railroad these innocent men to the gallows. This plot will succeed unless there is such an uprising of the working class of America as to frighten the conspirators away from their murderous intention. Having removed Heinze, their only competitor, the Standard Oil forces found themselves in absolute control of industrial and political conditions in the Rocky Mountain states. Between them and unbounded profits stood only the resistance of the class conscious working class organization, the Western Federation of Miners. In spite of all the lawless outrages that have been perpetrated against that organization during the years just passed it had continued to grow in strength, solidarity, and aggressiveness. Every effort to fasten upon its leaders the crimes committed by the Employers Alliance had failed. No jury could be found sufficiently corrupt in the state of Colorado, capitalist ridden as that state is, to send them to the penitentiary or hang them without at least some shadow of evidence. So it was determined to spirit them away to a state where courts and juries were thought to be even more subservient.

The response of the working class of America to this attack has been the most striking and gratifying event that has happened in America in recent years. The capitalist forces were depending largely for success upon the antagonism which was known to exist between the Western Federation of Miners and the old pure and simple Unions and especially the United Mine Workers. They felt especially sure of the hostility of the U. M. W. or at least of its helplessness at this moment when that organization is threatened with the largest strike in its history. Judge what must have been their astonishment when, without a moment's debate and by a unanimous vote, the very organization upon which they had depended to assist them in their battle against those men whom they sought to murder voted \$5000.00 for their defense.

The I. W. W. took up the work of agitation at once and prepared and sent out to working class organizations throughout the U. S. thousands of copies of a manifesto calling for the organization of protest meetings and preparation for active assistance in every way. They also secured the services of Clarence S. Darrow to assist in the defense of the accused men. All the socialist papers responded promptly to the occasion with an editorial denunciation and with calls for action. The National Secretary sent the following telegram to Comrades Moyer and Haywood:

"Chicago, Ill., Feb. 19, 1906.

Chas. H. Moyer; Wm. D. Haywood,
Penetentiary, Boise, Idaho.

The purchased confession, the secret special train makes the conspiracy of Capitalism complete. Russian methods make pertinent the question: Is Colorado in America? Rockefeller reported successfully evading summons. Platt and Depew safe in the Senate.

Your comrade,
J. MAHLON BARNES,
National Sec'y."

The *Appeal to Reason* arranged for a special correspondent to be on the field during the trial and has promised to use all its energies in placing the truth before the American workers. Meantime developments in the West would seem to indicate that the capitalists were just beginning to awake to a realization of what they were stirring up and that already the conspiracy was falling to pieces.

If it is made evident to the capitalists of the entire country that further prosecution of these men will mean the capture of a half dozen cities and perhaps some states by the socialists with a good bunch of socialist members in congress this fall there is no doubt but what the hanging will be interfered with. This is the strongest response that can be made. The outrage is naturally one which is arousing thoughts of meeting, violence with violence and it is certain that if these lawless and murderous tactics are long pursued that the working class of America will be aroused to the point where the campaign of assassination on the part of the capitalists will be met by open revolt on the part of the workers. At the present time, however, all talk of armed resistance is foolish. There are not enough men inspired with the feeling of independent revolt in this country as yet to do anything effective. Until more have been roused to the point where they know enough to vote straight, it is pretty certain that their shooting would not be strikingly accurate. The same is true of the utilization of the general strike. Without one half the provocation which has existed in Colorado, Italian laborers tied up the industries of that entire country until the wrongs were righted. At the present time, however, with the larger portion of the labor organizations of the United States in the hands of men who are in secret or open alliance with the capitalist class any effective concerted national action is out of the question. General strikes for defense of working class rights are not planned at Civic Federation banquets. The only immediate action which can be taken is to arouse an indignation which can later be directed into intelligent channels of revolt and to gather funds which may be used to fight for the lives of these men at the moment. It may be true that the "blood of martyrs is the seed of the church" but comrades Haywood and Moyer are too good men to be looked at in any such cold way as this. Seldom has the labor party produced two finer men than these. We have no doubt but that the other men who are arrested are equally worthy of confidence and esteem, but it so happens that only the first two are known to us personally. We can not believe that any jury which would look into their faces would fail to see that whatever else they might be guilty of, a secret conspiracy to hire any one else to do murder would be absolutely out of the question.

We publish herewith the letter of Joseph Medill Patterson resigning his position as Commissioner of Public Works of the city of Chicago. The full significance of this letter may not be apparent to those who do not live in the neighborhood of the city of Chicago and are not familiar

with recent events in the Dunne administration. It will be recalled that Mayor Dunne was elected on the most radical municipal ownership platform of any man in America. Mr. Patterson was the one man in his administration of whom it was claimed that he was really accomplishing anything. He had taken up the fight for reform more aggressively and more effectively than perhaps any other man in official position in the United States. He was the one "living example" to which the Hearst papers were pointing as showing the possibility of what could be done by following out their platforms. When he now comes out with the statement that he was practically accomplishing nothing and declaring that the entire radical public ownership position is inadequate that opinion is in every sense of the word a highly expert one. It is condemnation from the lips of the man who perhaps better than any other man is best fitted to speak on the subject.

The debate which took place in Los Angeles on Feb. 20th between Comrade Arthur Morrow Lewis and Job. Harriman is another significant item proving, from another point of view, the facts brought out by Mr. Patterson's letter. Mr. Harriman, who had behind him the prestige of having been the vice-presidential nominee of the socialist party in 1900 and whose ability as a debator will be conceded by all socialists, attempted to justify the formation of a radical union party on the coast. He was met by Comrade Lewis, championing the position of the socialist party. The resulting vote of the audience showed that Harriman had suffered an overwhelming defeat in the debate.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

FRANCE.

The general elections for the Chamber of Deputies take place during the month of May and the parties are now engaged in active campaign. In spite of all sorts of "unity" the socialist forces are still somewhat badly broken up. There will be many "socialist" candidates in the field aside from those put forth by the party.

The *Vorwaert's* Paris correspondent says, "Down with Socialism will be the watchword in all sections of the bourgeoisie. As a consequence socialism will play so great a role in public life that even its opponents must use the name. The coming electoral campaign will see 'true socialists' of all possible shades shoot up."

Eugene Fourniere in the *Sozialistische Monats-Hefte*, writing from the opportunist point of view, is of the opinion that no great gain can be expected. It must be remembered in this connection that the *Syndicalists*—the partisans of the general strike and exclusive trades union activity, have also tended to disrupt and disorganize the socialist movement. Those who know the history of socialist progress, however, will see in this momentary disintegration the signs of an upheaval which may be depended upon to crystalize into a definite socialist movement in the near future.

DENMARK.

The elections have recently been held for the Upper House of the Councils. These elections are carried on under a system with restricted suffrage so that it is very difficult for the proletarian party to make its strength felt. In many cases the socialists entered into an alliance with the Liberals as their only means of gaining representation. However, in eight cities they put forward purely social democratic tickets and in six of these were completely victorious. In six other cities the ticket contained only one Liberal the remainder being socialists, and in all these cases the ticket was victorious. Throughout the whole country the socialists elected 155 representatives, the Radicals eighty, and the Reactionary combination 182. The socialists succeeded in electing some representatives in fifty different cities. The extent of the socialist advance is shown by a comparison with the last two similar elections. In 1894 the Conservatives were the dominant party in a majority of the cities. The Social Democrats only elected ten representatives in eight cities. At the next election in which they could take part, that of 1900, the Conservatives lost their majority in the class elected by universal suffrage and 208 representatives were gained by the allied democracy composed of the Left

and the Social Democracy. The socialists gained 56 representatives in 25 cities. As has just been noted the present election gave them 155 seats in fifty cities. The heaviest loss is suffered by the Reform party of the Lefts which in many cities has been completely wiped out as an independent party.

SWITZERLAND.

The more that is known about Switzerland the less it appears to be the workingman's Paradise that middle class reformers of this country have always hailed it to be. A recent investigation into child labor has shown a most terrible condition of affairs. There is no protection offered in Switzerland against child labor except in factories and an investigation was recently set on foot by the *Gemeinnützige Gesellschaft* (Social Welfare Society) as to the extent to which children were employed in home-industries, agriculture, and other non-factory industries. Unfortunately the inquiry was not complete since the administration of several of the Cantons, among others, that of Zurich, refused to give it their support. Of the 24 Swiss Cantons only 13 took part in the inquiry. In spite of this incompleteness the investigation showed a most wretched picture of the exploitation of child labor. The inquiry was carried on through the teachers. It was discovered that out of a total of 279,551 school children 117,126 were regularly employed in agriculture; that 17,762 were employed in house industries or hand work, and that 14,194 were employed in other industries, all of a productive industrial character. Altogether therefore 149,083, or 53 per cent., of the children were engaged in some regular profit making occupation. In one Canton three-fourths of the children worked from four to six daily, many of them much longer, in addition to their school hours. 2,790 worked regularly on Sunday also. 12,000 were compelled to work during extraordinarily early hours (from 4 to 6 in the morning) and about five thousand at extremely late hours (from 9 to 11 P. M. and later). The exploitation of those who had "places" with farmers were especially bad. The teachers reported that these were most shamefully exploited, a 12 to 15 hour labor period being the rule. The result of this exploitation showed itself naturally in the school. Many teachers declared that fully 40 per cent. of the children were stunted by the labor demanded of them. For all these children the school is only an additional burden. They are all mentally backward.

There has recently been a split in the Swiss Social Democracy. This is really but a falling off of those members of the old *Grütliverein*, which joined the organization in a body in Nov. 1901. This body was almost exclusively a small capitalist organization but it had been slowly permeated by socialist propaganda until a majority of its membership had become socialists. Now, however, those who were not really willing to accept the socialist position have fallen away.

ITALY.

Recent elections held in Turin showed the regular steady increase in the socialist vote although a combination of the reactionary forces triumphed for this election. The socialist vote for the last three elections is as follows 1899, 6373; 1902, 7868; 1905, 8681, and at the present election 10,283.

HUNGARY.

The Austrian situation grows more acute constantly. The demand of the Hungarians for universal suffrage has thrown the whole political situation into confusion. Parliament has been called three times and as many times immediately dissolved by the crown. An attempt is being made by

the Hungarian bourgeoisie to turn the revolutionary energy into nationalistic channels and there is apt to be an armed revolt with a disruption of the Austria-Hungarian empire. The socialists are meanwhile carrying on an ever increasing campaign for universal suffrage and whether the expected disruption takes place or not their demands can not be long postponed.

GERMANY.

There seem to be many signs of a movement on the part of the German authorities to once more inaugurate a reign of legal repression against the socialists. The editor of the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* has recently been condemned to a year and nine months imprisonment for the circulation of an article which would not have hitherto been considered illegal.

According to the *Reichs Anzeiger* the Prime Minister Von Beulow was interrogated in the upper house of the Prussian Landtag as to when steps were going to be taken to suppress the socialists. The questioner asked: "Is any further proof needed that the suppression of the Social Democracy is not possible by the application of legal methods and that we have now reached a period where other methods must be created in order to overthrow these revolutionary gentlemen. A strong and well developed law must be thought out to produce this effect We think, however, that if the party found itself met with a somewhat sharper application of present laws much could be accomplished without far reaching new measures. The present government, to be sure, does its best in fighting the Social Democracy, but as far as we can see it has now reached a stage where the government has no effect on the masses."

Count Von Beulow replied to this: "The government maintains that there is no necessity of new legislation, but it will certainly make use of all the legal means at its disposal The decision as to when the moment has come when it will be necessary to apply to legislative bodies in order to secure strength and means with which to meet revolutionary uprisings must be left to the responsible government Much more is it necessary that the present parties should suppress all internal strife and unite against the common enemy and build the way to a coalition of all bourgeois elements for the battle against the revolutionary Social Democracy. The emergency is too great for us to permit ourselves the luxury of fighting one another I would send forth from this place my warning to the capitalist parties, stand together against the common enemy."

According to the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* the socialists are making gains into ever new fields. This paper bewails the horrible fact that in South Germany a Social Democrat has recently been elected as a chairman of a local *Kriegerverein* and that "instead, as has always hitherto been the custom, of adjourning the assemblage with shouts and hurrahs it was dissolved with the words, "Freedom, equality and brotherhood." The capitalist journal is, of course, of the opinion the assembly that should do such a thing as this should be at once expelled from the national organization.

The *Neue Hamburger Zeitung* in a panic stricken editorial entitled "Das rote Gespenst" (the red spectre) is shivering over the possibility that the German socialists may take a lesson from the Russian *massen-streik* and apply it at home.

ENGLAND.

The result of the English labor elections were given quite fully last month. The final count gives the following result:

Names	Votes	Members
Liberal.	2,669,339	309
L. R. C. & S. D. F.	334,920	29
Tory	2,406,731	157

In this table those labor men like Burt, Bell, Burns, Steadman, etc., who ran on the Liberal ticket without the endorsement of the Labor Representation Committee are designated as Liberals. There are some twenty of these which have been given in the majority of the reports from Europe as belonging to the labor group. In considering the vote of 334,920, which will probably be taken as the figure for the socialist vote of Great Britain from now on, two things must be remembered. First, tending to reduce it, that many of those endorsed by the L. R. C. were not socialists. Against this, however, must be set the fact that out of nearly six hundred districts, candidates were run in less than one hundred. This was because of the very high parliamentary expenses which are required to be deposited before a candidate can be offered. The consequence is that it is certain that there were a large number of socialists who were either disfranchised or else compelled to vote for capitalist candidates. There were certainly more of these than there were non-socialist voters voting for labor candidates. This is especially true when we consider that there were nearly as many candidates who ran directly as "labor men" with Liberal support, and that in nearly all cases local socialists endorsed and voted for these men where no socialist candidate was present. It is probable therefore that the socialist vote of Great Britain is somewhere in the neighborhood of half a million. As to the tactics of the new party and their effectiveness it is still too early to say much. There will be an Independent Labor Group in parliament with at least twenty-nine members. This group has elected Keir Hardy as its leader. He has announced that it will not be the policy of the group to attempt simply to occupy any position merely as holding the balance of power, and indeed at the present time the Liberals have a clear majority over both Conservative and Labor men,—but that a definite positive policy will be taken up. Among the measures receiving their support will of course be relief for the unemployed, better school facilities, etc.

Blatchford declares in the *Clarion*, that: "The Socialist movement is not a small local revolt which can be quelled with smooth flatteries and pretty promises. It is the beginning of a world wide revolution. It will save the Liberal press and the Liberal leaders a great deal of time and trouble and disappointment if they will make themselves acquainted with the books and journals of the socialist and Labor parties. As long as there remains a poor man, a hungry or untaught child, an overworked or dishonored woman; as long as the unfortunate are persecuted, and the undeserving are exalted; until the earth belongs to all men, and all men are free, and masters and servants are no more—the socialists will fight for socialism, and will relentlessly attack and ruthlessly smash any and every party that opposes the emancipation of the race."

In the same strain Comrade Hyndman closes an able editorial on, "The Labor Party, Its Dangers and Opportunities," in *Justice* with these words:

"It is a grand chance to give a lead to Great Britain, to Europe, and to the world. None will rejoice so heartily as we shall if it is taken full advantage of. But whatever happens, we out-and-out Social Democrats know full well that the future is ours. Socialism in England has come to stay both in and out of Parliament, and many of the young men who read this article will live to witness and triumph in the greatest social revolution of all time."

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

As has been foreshadowed in the REVIEW, another great crisis is impending in the mining industry. The miners have held their conventions, made their demands, negotiated with the operators, and at this writing both sides are feverishly preparing for the struggle that seems almost inevitable. There is, of course, always a chance that some sort of compromise may be patched up before the first of April, but it is a slim chance, indeed. At least a portion of the operators—especially those who have great stocks of coal in reserve and who are bitterly opposed to the “meddling unions” that interfere with their coupon-clipping exercises—are anxious that a national suspension take place, for then, they argue, while the workers are being starved into submission, the price of coal will soar upward in leaps and bounds. It is variously estimated that from 8,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons of coal are piled up for just such an emergency as threatens and since the adjournment of the Indianapolis convention the piles have steadily grown in size, so that certain of the operators claim the market can be supplied with coal for six months to a year. Then, again, they would have the non-union bituminous districts of Pennsylvania and West Virginia to fall back upon. It is a fact that all the available vessels in the ports of Cleveland, Ashtabula, Buffalo, Conneaut, Lorain, and other shipping centers along Lake Erie have been chartered and loaded with coal, at an additional cost of 10 to 15 cents a ton for storage, which is to be transported to the West and Northwest when navigation opens and sold at increased prices. Usually the railways do not begin to receive lake coal until the middle of March, but in the past six weeks the roads have been choked with heavy shipments. The situation is not unlike a great stampede after a battle, when every effort is made to prevent as many of the valuable stores as possible from falling into possession of the enemy. But the war has not yet begun. When the engagement does begin, if no settlement is affected, an army of upward of half a million workers—representing perhaps 3,000,000 human souls—will be in the field opposed by a mere handful of well-groomed plutocrats entrenched behind impregnable forts of class privilege. Not only will the army of workers be entirely unarmed, but they will be weighted down by empty stomachs and suffering and starving women and children. The fat men in the forts, on the other hand, have but to wave their hands when bands of Cossacks, the iron and coal police and militia, and the bewigged and besmirched harlots of the bench with their injunctions, and governors and mayors and sheriffs in platoons will ride down upon the defenseless mob and cut and slash right and left, and all because the mob claims the right to a living wage for mining coal to prevent society from freezing to death

and to keep the wheels of industry moving. Now this may be an ideal state of affairs to the mind of your average pure and simple "labor leader," who has a cornpion fit when you suggest the advisability of political action to capture the powers of government, which includes the military Cossacks, the judicial and administrative jumping-jacks, but to a plain, ordinary, everyday member of the rank and file, who is not heralded in the capitalistic newspapers as being "great," such tactics appear to be the height of imbecility and downright stupidity. However, the economic condition in which the miners are situated will probably dawn upon them with full force some time in the not distant future, when it can be taken for granted that they will move together politically in a mighty army as they are now accustomed to do industrially. The miners, much like the farmers, are a simple folk. Their humdrum existence in small, remote villages and camps makes them such. It is only when a great national struggle portends or is in progress that they become fully aroused, and they display all the self-sacrifice, fortitude and heroism of men engaged in actual battle. Whether a national suspension comes in one or both of the mining fields on the first of the month, or whether some compromise is arranged that may tend to postpone for a year or two the struggle that must finally come between combined capital and organized labor, it is certain that the miners will have the undivided support and sympathy of every trade unionist and socialist on this continent. When a battle is on it is nothing short of high treason to quibble and split hairs over matters of detail and tactics. The fight must be made, no matter what the drawbacks are.

If the miners' strike begins on April 1st it is not improbable that a struggle will begin simultaneously on the great lakes which will finally result in affecting at least another hundred thousand men. The marine workers, like those in all lines of industry, are confronted by a powerful combine which seeks to insert an entering wedge to destroy the organized forces of labor that stand as a menace to the master class and dispute the right of the latter to conduct "their business" as they choose without giving the slightest consideration to those who do their work. There is a little dark cloud on the horizon that is gradually growing larger and may develop a hurricane. It will be remembered that a year ago the lake carriers fought the mates and pilots, who had an independent organization, and defeated the men. The bosses declared that the pilots had no right to organize and demand recognition as a union, but must occupy the position of representatives of the owners on board vessels. Otherwise, they said, their properties would be at the mercy of the unions completely. Recently the Lake Carriers' Association held a convention in Detroit, where the gauntlet was thrown down to the Lake Pilots' Protective Association, which was formed after the last strike and chartered by the American Federation of Labor. The shipping "masters" announced that under no circumstances would they treat with this particular union. Subsequently the pilots held a convention and instructed their executive officers to reply to the ultimatum. A few weeks ago the latter met in Cleveland and drafted the following manifesto, which is herewith given in full because, firstly, it is an important document in the present industrial crisis, and, secondly, it was generally suppressed by the daily newspapers for obvious reasons:

"Regarding the position taken by the Lake Carriers' Association, through its executive committee (which is controlled by the United States Steel trust, tug trust and other corporations), to say the least, is rather a peculiar one. They themselves have a union (capitalistic, of course), which has for its purpose the advancement of their own interests, and according to their way of thinking is entirely proper.

"This trust of trusts does, however, recognize the right of some of

its employes to organize into unions which include the masters (with the understanding that the officers of the organization will be selected from and by the vessel-owners) just as fully as the pilots, have a union which is virtually recognized by the Lake Carriers' and Lumber Carriers' Associations.

"While it is true that there is no written contract, yet they submit their proposition to the vessel-owners, specifying the wages and conditions under which they will work, which is accepted by the vessel-owners without change. This certainly implies the existence and recognition of a contract, which becomes legalized by both sides accepting and complying with its mandates.

"In the face of all this, the lake carriers contend that the pilots (mates) must not join a labor organization. The Lake Pilots' Protective Association is a bona fide labor union, affiliated directly with the American Federation of Labor, and has come to stay.

"The declaration of war issued against the pilots' union is but the beginning of the hostile policy which the lake carriers have been contemplating for some time against all marine organizations.

"We, therefore, in our effort to obtain justice and fair play, appeal to all marine workers, as well as organized labor generally, for their moral support and endorsement, in our efforts to bring about the same privileges as other wage earners enjoy, viz., the right to organize.

"There is no middle-of-the-road course; the unions that are not with us must be considered against us. We hope to receive a frank and positive expression from all wage earners, particularly the marine organizations, as we are confident that if the vessel-owners realize that we have the support and sympathy of all our co-workers, they certainly will see the advisability of modifying their present position."

The gravity of the situation will become all the more readily understood when it is explained that not only the officers of the pilots, but the rank and file are determined to test the strength of the vessel-owners, but likewise the fealty of their affiliated organizations. The pilots are really under the wing of the International Longshoremen, Marine and Transport Workers, who organized the former in opposition to the licensed pilots controlled by the Seamen's Union. Whether this rivalry will tend to aid the bosses, or whether the dual organizations will stand together when the critical moment arrives, is a question that seems to be undecided at this writing. In discussing the outlook for the spring when navigation opens, National President Bush, of the pilots, said to me: "I believe a fight is coming, and if the shipping combine should succeed in defeating us they will attack the longshoremen next. But if even the oilers and water-tenders stand by us we can tie up practically every vessel that floats upon the lakes. I am certain that we will have the assistance of other marine organizations." Another officer, who exacted a promise that his name must not be used, said: "It is now up to Dan Keefe (president of the longshoremen) and his men. We will refuse to work with scabs on the vessels or play into the hands of those on shore. If organization means anything, we have a right to the same treatment that other marine workers are demanding and receiving. The longshoremen cannot consistently do anything else but stand with us, and the sailors will hardly dare to oppose us."

When it is considered further that a strike on the lakes might spread into other trades the possible magnitude of the impending struggle on the first of April or thereabouts will begin to be appreciated. While the miners might succeed in shutting off production quite thoroughly, they or other unions working in harmony with them must likewise be prepared to block distribution of the mountains of coal that have been stored for emergency purposes or that may be mined in the scab districts of West

Virginia and Pennsylvania. Otherwise the struggle would be prolonged and result in a contest of endurance, with the miners at a disadvantage. Aside from the industrial advantage that might be obtained by tying up lake traffic just at a time when the miners are engaged in the greatest struggle in their history, the two men at the head of the two great organizations are the warmest of personal friends. It was Dan Keefe who, in the presidential campaign of 1900, during the first anthracite strike, played the part of the "mysterious stranger" and carried on negotiations between Mark Hanna, the dominating political boss, J. P. Morgan, the ruling industrial boss, and John Mitchell, whose word was law with the miners, and finally arranged the settlement. Both, Keefe and Mitchell, are vice-presidents of the A. F. of L. and usually chum together and vote as a unit on all questions. Both must realize that a critical period has arrived and that if either of their organizations are defeated it would mean a terrible blow to the trade union movement. Therefore, it is not improbable that the mine workers would play an important part in a struggle between the miners and operators in paralyzing the transportation end of the business. Meanwhile Gompers appears to be completely overshadowed. Nobody seemed to notice him or pay the slightest attention to what he thinks or says. In fact, Coal Baron Robbins has declared in no unmistakable terms that the Civic Federation will not be permitted to "butt in" on the fight. If Gompers had any backbone, and dared to fight the capitalists as hard as he does the puny Socialists who meet with his displeasure, he would call a special session of the A. F. of L. executive board immediately and issue a proclamation to all organized labor to contribute funds to the unions involved or go on strike whenever or wherever they were forced to use or handle scab products. But it is doubtful whether Gompers will do anything but utter ponderous platitudes about conciliation, meditation, arbitration and procrastination, so that the workers will continue to have hellandamnation forever and anon. If only somebody would kidnap the "Little Napoleon" and maroon him on an island for a couple of years, they would be doing the American labor movement an inestimable service. But Gompers is safe (and sane) from the capitalist viewpoint.

When Moyer, Haywood and Gillespie were kidnapped in Denver and spirited into Idaho, Standard Oil once more displayed its claws. That another foul plot has been concocted by those imps of hell, the Pinkerton thugs, every intelligent workingman believes, and while it is not my purpose to discuss this latest outrage here, as it will no doubt be referred to in the editorial department, I will make the prediction that several million union men and Socialists, who are watching every move that is made in this Western drama, will not stand for a second Haymarket martyrdom. If Moyer, Haywood and other officials are railroaded to the gallows it will be a sorry day for the conspirators in high places. Lawson, Tarbell, Lloyd and other writers have already shown that the grand dukes in Standard Oil will not hesitate to stoop to the most infamous crimes to gain their ends. The terrorism of Standard Oil from Coeur d'Alene to Cripple Creek may triumph for a time, but those who sow the wind must reap the whirlwind sooner or later.

BOOK REVIEWS

TRADE UNIONISM AND LABOR PROBLEMS. *Edited by John R. Commons.*
Ginn & Co. Cloth, 628 pages, \$2.50.

This is one of a series of books applying what is known as the "case method" to social problems. Papers by various authors treating different phases of the trade union question are brought together. These papers are almost entirely descriptive in character, treating either of the forms of organization, events or policies of the trades unions. There are twenty-eight such papers in the volume under consideration not including an introduction summarizing the most salient points brought out by the articles. The most valuable papers are those contributed by the editor and especially those treating of the "Teamsters of Chicago," "Labor Conditions in Slaughtering and Meat Packing" and the "Sweating System in the Clothing Trade." The paper on the introduction of the "Linotype" by George E. Barnett is also an instructive study of almost the only successful attempt by trades unions to meet the machinery problem. One of the most striking things about the book is the fact that although it is made up of current articles it was found necessary in a large number of cases to add foot notes explaining important changes which had taken place since the writing of the original article. In many cases still further changes have taken place in the few months that have elapsed between final compilation and publication. The entire situation in "Slaughtering and Meat Packing" and "The Chicago Teamsters" for instance has been completely changed and in both cases the unions have almost disappeared from the field. Another paper which deserves especial attention is the one by J. W. Sullivan on "The Printers' Health." A series of such papers covering the various trades and showing the physical conditions existing in them would be of very great value. The only attempt to really discuss the problems of labor in anything approaching a broad way is to be found in the final chapters on "Employers' Liabilities," "Workingmen's Insurance in Germany," and "Insurance Against Unemployment." There is no presentation of any criticism of the wage system as such, no discussion of the movement of unions toward political action, no consideration of the effects of consolidation of capital in the form of Employers' Associations, Civic Federations, etc., upon the working class. As a reference book, however, it occupies a peculiarly valuable place, bringing together as it does a great variety of information from so many sources.

A KNIGHT OF THE TOILERS, *by Arthur Newell.* *T. L. Marsh and Co., Philadelphia, Cloth, 270 pp.*

A social novel in many ways unique. It is one of those in which the preaching transcends the plot, and yet without loss of interest. Indeed,

there is little to be called a plot. Trevor, the hero, and the trusted employe of a coal-magnate, is asked to become a party to a reduction of the wages of former competitors, now employes of Pattison, the coal trust owner, to the level of mere office men. He refuses the conditions of consolidation had contained a contract specifically providing against such a reduction. Trevor hands in his resignation and takes up work as a miner. He organizes the men on strictly "business lines." The money which would have gone into strike funds was invested in co-operative stores. As this capital grows a portion is finally invested in farm lands and when the great strike comes part of the miners go to work on the farms to feed the others. They use the most perfect machinery and produce enough to feed those who remain near the mines as pickets. When at last the mine owners are forced to surrender they are met with a claim for damages sustained, which they are forced to pay and are at last informed that the laborers propose to reduce the compensation of the capitalists down to the wages of superintendency. As a piece of clever writing, shrewd analysis and unique reasoning the book is remarkably good. If the author really means it as a piece of sober advice, indicating a possible line of development of labor organizations, within capitalism it is a subject to criticism. But if it is intended rather as a suggestion of a possible evolution along with the overthrow of the political power of capitalism and still more as an illustration of the workings of the present system it is a clever valuable work.

FRENZIED FINANCE: THE CRIME OF AMALGAMATED. By Thomas W. Lawson, Ridgway, Thayer & Co. Cloth, 559 pages, \$1.50.

The subject matter of this book is so familiar to our readers that it is useless to review it. There is a tendency at the present time, partly we believe a reflex of the capitalist comment, to belittle what Lawson has done. To read this book now when it has all become a matter of common knowledge and indeed an integral part of the public mind gives one the impression that these facts have always been known and commonly published, but if we open up any periodical publication, even the most radical outside of socialist ranks, of two years ago and compare it with those of to-day a tremendous difference is at once apparent. To be sure the fundamental cause of this difference has been the industrial evolution, but more than any other one individual Lawson must be credited with assisting in this development. The insurance scandals are now a matter of record, yet when Lawson wrote not a word had been published. It is very easy to point out his shortcomings. He writes fundamentally from the point of view of small investors, his attack after all is not on the capitalist "system," but on a system within capitalism, a system which is playing the game a little too strenuously for the class of small investors. Proceeding from this point of view there is little danger in predicting that Lawson will fall very flat when he comes to exploit his much advertised "Remedy." Nevertheless this book is by far the most important contribution to the great literature of exposure which marks the declining years of capitalism.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE. By H. J. Darius. Defender Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa. Paper, 160 pages, 25 cents.

An anti-catholic book, much after the character of the A. P. A. literature of ten years ago. Belongs in the same category with Calvinistic the-

ology and emotional revivalism on the one hand and Tom Payne and Ingersoll Atheism on the other. Has no conception of the social function played by religion and the effects of industrial conditions upon religious life.

WHY THE CHURCH OPPOSES SOCIALISM. *By Fred. D. Warren. Appeal to Reason. Paper, 36 pages, 5 cents.*

A compact valuable discussion of a special subject, is largely made up of quotations showing the attitude of the churches to the question of chattel slavery, with a short discussion of the relation of religion to industrial conditions.

BIBLE, BEER AND SOCIALISM. *By S. J. Brownson, M. D. Published by the author at Fayetteville, Ark. Paper, 36 pages, 10 cents.*

An argument to show that socialism presents the only solution of the liquor question; contains large numbers of "proof texts" to prove that "prohibition is contrary to the teachings of the Bible."

THE GRAIN TRUST EXPOSED. *Tom Worrall. The Public Publishing Co., Chicago. Paper, 211 pp., 50 cents.*

This is an interesting and quite valuable monograph on the working of the grain and elevator trust in Nebraska. So far as the historical portion is concerned the work is well done. When it comes to remedies we have the same old little dealer's attitude shouting for free competition. We have the same florid rhetoric of denunciation, the same cries that if the railroads would give us a chance we would be all right, which has been behind every Populist, Granger and middle class movement in general ever since there have been railroads and before that the howl was directed at some other "natural monopoly."

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

This new library is a distinct advance on anything yet done in the way of socialist book-making in America. It contains only books of unquestioned value and presents them in a substantial and artistic form, while the price to our co-operators is just about a third of what such books would ordinarily cost if published by capitalist houses.

1. *The Changing Order*, by Dr. Oscar L. Triggs, was discussed editorially on page 504 of last month's REVIEW. It rounds out the socialist thought on a side thus far left almost untouched, the relation of the coming industrial democracy to the intellectual life.

2. *Better-World Philosophy*, by J. Howard Moore, is also reviewed in our issue of last month; see page 505. It is perhaps the clearest and best-balanced discussion of the whole philosophy of life, especially with reference to ethics, that has yet been written from the socialist view-point.

3. *The Universal Kinship*, by J. Howard Moore, is a book of much greater length than the one just mentioned, and starts out with an array of facts and logic that will make any thinking reader see that the evolution of man from lower forms of life is no longer a tentative theory but the only possible conclusion from things positively known. The author then goes on to prove that the mind of man as well as his body is the inevitable outcome of the universe in which he lives. In his concluding chapters he proceeds to draw certain conclusions regarding the ethical relationships of man to man and of the human race to other races. The style of the book is delightfully simple, and the entire work is well worthy of careful study.

3. *Principles of Scientific Socialism*, by Charles H. Vail, is generally recognized as the best popular statement of the International socialist position to be had in the English language. It has run through many editions, but this is the handsomest that has yet appeared.

5. *Some of the Philosophical Essays* of Joseph Dietzgen, is one of the most important additions to the literature available to American socialists that has been made for years. Dietzgen has long been recognized by European socialists as one of the founders of the socialist philosophy, and this book contains some of his most important writings. It will be ready for delivery about the last of April or first of May.

6. *Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History*, by Antonio Labriola, was published a little over two years ago, and is selling more rapidly than at the start. It is a book that requires close study, but it also repays close study. No one who wishes to understand socialism should be without it.

7. *Love's Coming-of-Age*, by Edward Carpenter, is now in its fourth American edition. It is beyond doubt the most satisfactory book yet published on the sex problem as affected by the great economic changes now in progress.

All these books except Volume 5 are now ready. They sell for a dollar a volume, postage included. Stockholders get them at 60c. post-paid or 50c. by express. We expect to have at least two more volumes to announce in next month's Review; meanwhile we ask every socialist to order these.

NEW VOLUMES IN THE STANDARD SOCIALIST, SERIES.

12. *The Positive School of Criminology*. Three Lectures by Enrico Ferri delivered at the University of Naples. Translated by Ernest Untermann. The application of the Marxian theory of economic determinism has revolutionized the science of criminology, and Enrico Ferri, at once a university professor and one of the leading socialists of Europe, stands recognized by capitalists and socialists alike as the ablest representative of the new school of criminology. He recognizes crime as the necessary outgrowth of economic conditions, and discusses the best methods of dealing with it under capitalism, with a full recognition all the while that crime must last while capitalism lasts. This is a work that will interest every judge and lawyer, no matter how bitter an opponent of socialism, because it gives new facts that the judges and lawyers need in their business.

13. *The World's Revolutions*. By Ernest Untermann. This new work is far simpler and more popular in style than the author's "Science and Revolution," yet at the same time it is an equally important contribution to socialist thought. The titles of the chapters are:

- I. The Individual and the Universe.
- II. Primitive Human Revolutions.
- III. The Roman Empire and its Proletariat.
- IV. The Christian Proletariat and its Mission.
- V. Feudal Ecclesiasticism and its Disintegration.
- VI. The American Revolution and its Reflex in France.
- VII. Bourgeois Revolutions in Europe.
- VIII. The Proletarian World Movement.

14. *The Socialists, Who they Are and What they Stand for*. By John Spargo. This book, the first edition of which will be ready early in April, is on the whole the best book for general propaganda use that has yet been written. It is brief yet comprehensive. The style is clear enough to make easy reading for the uneducated, yet artistic enough to attract the educated. The type is exceptionally large and clear; the margins are wide while the size of the book is convenient for the pocket, and socialists will find it just the thing to lend until it is worn out. It is an uncompro-

misgiving statement of the principles of International Socialism, but it is written in a way to persuade rather than antagonize the American reader who comes to this book for his first impressions of the Socialists.

Ferri's book is now ready, and Untermann's will be ready about March 25. All the volumes in the Standard Socialist Series sell at fifty cents each postpaid; to stockholders thirty cents by mail or twenty-five cents by express.

THE TRIUMPH OF LIFE, BY WILHELM BOELSCHKE.

This, the fifth volume of the Library of Science for the Workers, which was first announced several months ago, will be ready by the time this issue of the *INTERNATIONAL REVIEW* is in the hands of its readers. The style of this book is even more absorbing than that of "The Evolution of Man," by the same author. In this work life, starting with the lowest organic forms and culminating in man, is shown gradually overcoming its environment and molding the inorganic world to suit its purposes. It is a book that should be studied by all who fear that materialism leads to a denial of the power of mind. The translation is by May Wood Simons. The original German work contained no illustrations, but our edition has a dozen engravings reproduced from Haeckel's "Art Forms in Nature," which are a decided help to the understanding of the text.

"The Making of the World," by Dr. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Ernest Untermann, will be ready in April, and "Life and Death," by Dr. E. Teichmann, is being translated by A. M. Simons for publication a little later. These volumes in the Library of Science for the Workers sell at fifty cents a volume, with the usual discount to stockholders.

DAMAGED COPIES OF "THE ANCIENT LOWLY," VOLUME I.

As already announced, we have purchased from the heirs of C. Osborne Ward all unsold copies of his books. Among them are some two hundred copies of the first volume of "The Ancient Lowly" with the covers slightly damaged, not enough to affect the durability of the books, while in most cases the damage is so slight as to be scarcely noticeable. We secured these damaged copies at a special price, and we wish to realize on them at once, since our contract requires us to make a heavy payment to the Osborne Ward heirs on the tenth day of each month from April to June inclusive. These books retail for two dollars a volume, and the first volume is a complete work in itself, having been published separately long before the second volume was written.

We have a special limited offer to make to all the readers of *THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW*, which positively will not appear again and will not hold good after April 15, 1906. Up to that time we will send a damaged copy of *The Ancient Lowly*, Volume I, postpaid, for seventy cents, or by express with other books at purchaser's expense for fifty cents. After that time, the book can not be had for less than \$2.00 except that stockholders can have the usual discount. There are no damaged copies of Volume II.

THE COMPANY'S FINANCES.

The only cash contribution to the work of the publishing house during February was \$2.00 from Albert Smith of Maryland. The receipts from the sale of stock were \$215.40, from the sale of books \$1,049.45.

from the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW subscriptions and sales \$192.43. The receipts from book sales are encouraging in that the gross profit on the books sold is ample to cover the running expenses of the business, but we are putting so much money into the printing of new books at this time that it is very essential that the sales for March be much larger, in order that we may take care of the printing bills as fast as they come due. And it is also necessary that the receipts of the REVIEW be increased, if a deficit is to be avoided.

It is also almost certain that it will be necessary for us to remove to a new location during the month of April, for the reason that the rent on the rooms we now occupy has been raised to a prohibitory figure. We hope next month to announce that a satisfactory location has been secured. Meanwhile the fact should be noted that the expense of moving will require a large outlay of ready money, and also that this expense can be kept down by selling off as much as possible of the stock now on hand, especially the more bulky and less valuable portion of it. A new and complete catalogue will be sent by return mail to any one requesting it, and every socialist is urged to send in as large a book order as possible without delay.

We also ask every reader of the REVIEW who has not already done so to subscribe ten dollars to the capital stock of the publishing house. Those who can not spare ten dollars at one time may pay for the stock in ten monthly installments, and may purchase books at special prices from the start. Full particulars regarding the organization of the company are given in the new catalogue.

We do not ask any one to subscribe for more than one share of stock, because it is essential that the control of the publishing house be kept in a large body of socialist co-operators, and not in any small group of investors. But there are two ways in which a socialist with money can help our work along effectively. One is by direct cash contributions. During 1904 and 1905 such contributions were received to the amount of \$4,520.88. If a like sum could be contributed this year it would enable us to increase immensely the output of socialist books. The stock pays no dividends, and no individual connected with the publishing house draws more than ordinary wages. The debt to outsiders is paid, and any contributions will at once be applied to the enlargement of our work.

The other way in which a socialist can help with money is by lending it to the publishing house. We receive loans without interest payable on demand, and loans at four per cent interest payable on sixty days' notice. We do not offer large interest, because the publishing house is not run on a profit-making basis. THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW is run at a loss because it publishes matter essential to the socialist movement rather than the matter that might find the readiest sale. The prices of books to our co-operators are fixed at prices that will just about cover the expense of publication. The new capital that will be needed can not therefore come from future profits, and we can not pay high interest rates nor guarantee dividends on stock with the expectation of future profits. Every share of stock is sold on the distinct understanding that there probably will never be any dividends, and the new capital to enlarge the business is expected to come from the sale of this stock. Meanwhile, we can enlarge the business more rapidly by the help of a limited amount of money on the terms we are offering, on sixty days' call with interest at four per cent., or payable on demand without interest. Any questions regarding the management of the business from stockholders or those considering the investment of money in the publishing house will be cheerfully answered.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

APRIL, 1906

NO. 10

Stagnation and Movement in Great Britain.

I DO not wonder that foreigners, and even Colonials and Americans, are utterly puzzled with this funny old country. To all appearance, we ought to be the most advanced nation in Socialism on the planet. Our population is essentially a proletariat, the people being almost entirely divorced from the soil; our economic growth is certainly, as a whole, not behind that of any European community; our personal liberties and political rights have been secured to us long ago by the courage and sacrifices of our forebears; living in no fear of serious invasion, we can dispense with the military preparations and organization that hamper continental peoples. Yet, here we are only just beginning to emerge from the social arrangements and political forms of a century, or two centuries, ago. It is really very remarkable, and I still adhere to the reasons I gave in the first number of this REVIEW to account for our arrested development. When we do begin to make way, also, nobody is aware of it. The capitalist press of Great Britain, as a whole, is run for advertisements, and advertisements only. Such editors as Barnes or Delane of the *Times*, Walker of the *Daily News*, Frederick Greenwood of the *Pall Mall Gazette*—men who left their mark on their day and generation—belong to a past period. Here and there a belated exception in a minor way still remains; but for the most part an editor today edits and writes with one eye glued on the advertisement returns. When these dwindle, even temporarily, out he goes. And as Socialism and Laborism are not popular with the class that pays for advertisements we heard, until lately, very little about them in the capitalist press.

The results of the elections, therefore, though nothing at all astonishing in themselves, have come upon our diletante, bridge-playing, motoring, golfing, pleasure-loving aristocrats, and their smug paymasters, the bourgeoisie, quite as a shock. The newspaper boycott and conspiracy of silence had deceived them. They thought there was no socialist movement at all. For years past, for example, I have been addressing as large audiences as any man in Great Britain, in London and in the provinces. I have carried on the social democratic propaganda steadily for a quarter of a century, and everybody is aware that I am an educated man. Yet, no matter how enthusiastic my hearers, or how crowded the halls, I am never reported. Much the same with others. Whatever happened, so it was assumed, the workers in this island could not be roused, and no journal would study what was going on for that axiomatic reason. We were fools and fanatics all.

And now, of course, with equal ineptitude, the significance of what has taken place is being absurdly exaggerated. As I said, when, with the hysterical excitement at present the principal characteristic of Englishmen, everybody was shouting about the "Triumph of Labor," and talking of the newly elected members as if they were heaven born geniuses of the people, suddenly developed from the mine, the mill, and the factory, this all merely connotes a tendency instead of recording a triumph. The workers here are beginning to shake themselves loose from the trammels of middle-class faction, and the sense of class-consciousness and the recognition of the class war is influencing them seriously for the first time since the Chartist movement. There is even quite a marked trend toward Socialism to be observed among tens and even hundreds of thousands of our population. But outside the men and women who are in, or who have passed through, the Social Democratic Federation, even this is, for the most part, a sentimental Socialism. We are still a long way from the formation of a thoroughly disciplined, well organized Socialist Party, and the new Labor Group has a hard task before it in the House of Commons. What has taken place, I admit, is very important; but much more as giving hope for the future than as securing anything of great value in the present.

This was seen at once at the conference of the Labor Party. Excellent resolutions were passed in the direction of socialism. Socialism and socialist speeches were cheered to the echo. But when a socialist delegate proposed that the members of the party should formerly subscribe to a definite program; when, in fact, it was suggested that the party should declare that anyone who belonged to it must be bound by the recorded decisions of the great majority of delegates there assembled; then there was an

obvious "scare," and the conference stoutly refused to decree anything so logical and so essential. The reason for this is clear. The object, quite a legitimate object as I hold, is to use the trade-union funds for political purposes, independently of either faction. But a large proportion of trade-unionists whose organizations are affiliated to the Labor Party are not in favor of socialism, except as a nebulous theory, and are not too fond of the name itself in any case. To commit the Labor Party to a definite program, therefore, would risk losing the party funds. You see.

The difference between the two sections came out very strongly on the election of the Parliamentary leader. We may not agree altogether with Keir Hardie, but he is the one man who alone has upheld the dignity of his class in Parliament, has never bowed the knee to the bourgeois Baal, and has sternly held aloof from the politicians and wire-pullers of both factions. He was entitled therefore to a unanimous vote if ever man was. In a total vote of 29, however, he was elected by a majority of only one! Three of his own Independent Labor Party men, I understand including Ramsay Macdonald, voted against him! He is a avowed socialist and his leadership might be too dangerous! Under such circumstances, it is the bounden duty of every socialist to back him, and it is quite certain that the capitalist Liberals do hate him. In the House of Commons the effect of his leadership instead of Shackleton's, the trade-unionist's, is already visible, and some of the party show signs of real vigor.

But all this proves how serious are the difficulties which lie immediately ahead of any thorough-going working-class party in Great Britain. Anywhere else the purchase of John Burns for £2000 a year and a seat in the cabinet, partly as a reward for his having defended and applauded Asquith for shooting down the miners at Featherstone, when the Liberals were last in office, would have deceived no one. Here a large section of the workers were completely gulled and flattered at one of their own men having been able to dispose of himself for such a high price, to their worst enemies. It is a remarkable fulfilment of what a very active political lady said to me nearly a quarter of a century ago, when we were at the beginning of the socialist movement in Great Britain: "You cannot win on those lines Mr. Hyndman. You will educate these men" — as a matter of fact I did educate John Burns — "and then we shall buy them, or, if we don't, the Liberals will, and that will be just the same to you." The truth is that, as Clemenceau, the brilliant French statesman and journalist said, when Lady Warwick and Jaures and he were lunching with me in Paris about a twelve month since: "*La classe ouvrière en Angleterre est une classe bourgeoise*" — The working class in England is a bourgeois class. That is still the case.

Taken as a whole, the clothes, the talk, the manners, the ideas, the aspirations of the English working man, on the way up, are those of the bourgeoisie. They aim at being successful shopkeepers, and their economics are those of the profit-mongers. Burns has done what many of them would like to do, "£2000 a year and possibilities is good gifts." They do not understand that such an acceptance of office in a capitalist government is a betrayal of their class, whose cause as a socialist he had championed until he saw his way to mount up on their shoulders. It is sad; but Judas' acceptance of the thirty shillings did not stop the spread of Christianity, and if John hanged himself, or were hanged tomorrow, that would not make much difference either. What is important is the fact that so many English and Scotch and Welsh workers are still such idiots as to cheer. Strange to say, however, since John Burns objected to wear gold braid and lace, and a cocked hat, and then donned them, and walked about in them, in order to keep his place and his salary, his popularity has decreased greatly. People applauded the sevility: they jib at the livery! But the whole posse of Liberal Labor members in the House of Commons still swear by "the Right Honorable gentleman," livery and all. They hope to wear a similar suit and get the same wages themselves by-and-bye.

Meanwhile, there is this huge Liberal majority, eager to carry pettifoggng measures so as to "dish the socialists" and keep back real progress for years. Will they succeed? I doubt it. A great majority, like a great army, must be kept on the march. And when the hosts of "*Manchesterthum*", begin to move their troubles will begin. Free Trade and Chinese slavery alone wont long hold them together, and everything else has a tendency to split them up. There is not a single man of first-rate ability, not one imposing personality, not even a considerable orator among them. It is a vast aggregation of clever and pompous mediocrities, sworn in to profit-mongering, free-trade and the Nonconformist breeches-pocket conscience. All too incompetent to lead, and all too conceited to follow.

Yet the situation they have to face calls for statesmanship, and statesmen of the highest order. The old methods of the incompetent and lackadaisical House of Commons of the past twenty years cannot hope to cope with present day problems. This the socialist wing of the Labor Party already sees, and I hope and believe that a minority will be ready, if any attempt is made by the Whigs and lawyers who dominate the Ministerial mob to shirk the great class issues which are now before us, to outrage all the silly and obsolete "forms of the House" in order to force their views to the front and to stir up a great agitation in the country. A determined group of even half a dozen can bring all public business to a standstill even today. And with

thirteen million of the people of the United Kingdom on the border line of starvation, as the Prime Minister himself declared, it is high time that a breach of decorum should be perpetrated in the interest of the disinherited class. At home and abroad, in politics and economics, in the Colonies and in India, in our relations with European and Asiatic powers questions are being pressed upon public attention which cannot possibly be answered on the old lines. In every direction we find that we are behind the times. Not a single reform of any importance can be carried through without butting up against vested interests or outworn systems which block the path to new and better arrangements. Such a state of things inevitably leads to a complete and rapid transformation, either peaceable or forcible. It is in the preparation for this crucial transformation that socialists, and to some extent, mere Labor men have their opportunity. Nobody else can possibly do the necessary work; for none of the others have freed their minds from the cant and hypocrisy of the old buy-cheap and sell-dear, production-for-profit, wage-slave capitalist system. Even the vast development of monopoly does not teach those who are convinced that competition is inevitable, and that when the bourgeoisie became masters of society history had written its last page. But we are moving in spite of all this stagnation. The over-grown British Empire has at last entered upon a period of reorganization, and the late General Election will hereafter be recognized as the small but significant symptom of coming crucial change at its center.

H. M. HYNDMAN.

London, March 7, 1906.

Since the above article was written the Labor Party in the House of Commons has had some opportunities of showing what it can do and it has come out well in these preliminary trials. Keir Hardie is showing himself to be a capable and dexterous leader and there can be no doubt that the whole of the initiative is with this group. The Liberal Labor set cuts a very poor figure and will cut a still poorer in the future I venture to predict. One matter we Social-Democrats may especially congratulate ourselves upon: the apparent certainty that free meals for children will be provided in the State-supported schools at public cost. I have a special personal satisfaction in noting that this proposal is now accepted by practically the whole House and that the hopeless doctrinaire Harold Cox could not get even a seconder to his resolution against the measure. When for the first time in modern history I proposed this important reform in 1882 just twenty-four years ago it was covered with contempt and ridicule. When we of the S. D. F. went as a deputation on the subject

some thirteen years ago we were still jeered at as ignorant fanatics or even as pestilent idiots. Now, the most brutal Liberal capitalists dare not openly oppose the suggestion. At any rate, the Labor Party has acted thoroughly well in this. Then the amendment drafted by Keir Hardie to Sir W. Kitsais resolution in favor of free trade, stating that neither Free Trade nor Protection could in any way solve the previous problems of poverty, was an admirable move. It put the Liberal Party in a most awkward position and its leaders discovered that there were now some men in the House of Commons who cared not a straw for the convenience of either of the factions of plunderers. I am told it is quite amusing to watch the fidgettings of Ministers who are unable to order about this section of the workers who keep and pay them as they do their own Liberal Labor people. It is something quite new and very unpleasant. Hardie is undoubtedly the best-hated man by the Liberals in the country to-day, and that is the greatest compliment it is possible to pay him, especially as the *Times* don't love him either. Anyhow independent labor going steadily on to Socialism must grow. Everybody sees that. What is more, Great Britain and the British Empire will play an ever-increasing part in International Socialism. Up to the Congress of Amsterdam the English-speaking peoples had played a comparatively insignificant part in that magnificent and ever victorious combination. Then we began to show our strength in friendly rivalry with our sister-nationalities and brother races. At Stuttgart in August 1907 and from then onwards I hope and trust we with our Colonies and with the U. S. in Socialist accord shall take one full share in preparing the way for the complete and final Social Revolution.

H. M. HYNDMAN.

King Kerosene and The Labor Movement.

All the "literature of exposure" combined with the investigations, private and governmental, have not sufficed to show the full extent to which the industrial life and thereby the social and governmental institutions of the U. S. have come to be directed from one dominating center. This is partly because of the rapidity of events. The wild exaggerations of the demagogues of yesterday become the established statistical facts of today, and will be transformed into the conservative claims of the defenders of existing institutions by to-morrow. Some of the more recent phases of concentrated industry in America bear directly upon problems and events which are occupying socialist thought and activity at the present moment and this may excuse their discussion now, if any excuses be necessary.

When a little more than one year ago John Moody pointed out that over twenty billions of the wealth of the U. S. had passed out of the competitive system into the stage of trustified monopoly it was one of those facts that are so large that they come to be accepted as a standard. So it has come about that this bald fact is commonly stated as marking a climax of industrial concentration, yet since this statement was made there has gone on, a movement both within these trustified industries and in the relation which they bear to the remaining industrial life which is in many respects of equally great importance with the movement noted by Mr. Moody. To be sure he points out the movement to which reference is made, but its full development was not then visible.

These monopolistic industries are just those which stand at the strategic points of the industrial process and by virtue of that fact their possessors have for many purposes almost as complete control over the eighty billions of small competitive business as they have over the twenty billions to which they hold legal title. Control and ownership is only for the purpose of exploitation, through the power which it grants to determine institutions and decide the direction of the flow of the stream of social wealth.

There are certain industries within this trustified mass which stand in a dominating position to the remainder. The possessors of these keys to the inner castle of industry dominate, not simply what is encircled by the trust moat, but are able to reduce to feudal tenure all the surrounding industrial fields. In the central hall of the castle sits what has come to be known as the "Standard Oil System." A slight examination suffices to

show how completely this group of capitalists have control of the inner defences of capitalism. Transportation is the one great essentially dominating phase of modern industrial life. Moody has shown that excluding the "useless worn-out or profitless railroad mileage" that "nearly 95 per cent of the vital railroad mileage" was controlled by this group of financiers nearly two years ago. Some of the additional 5 per cent has since been brought beneath their sway. These railroads own, lease, or otherwise control the entire anthracite and most of the bituminous coal fields. Next to transportation and fuel, and perhaps fully as basic as either, are the iron and steel industries owned by the same interests. In the mining of precious metals the prospecting and excavating with its gambling risk is still left to the competitive field, but the Standard Oil smelter trust stands ready to take the regular assured profits. With copper the case is different. Here the mines themselves are controlled and the new field of electrical industry is thereby reached and dominated wherever direct ownership has not been exercised. The lighting of the cities and electric transportation,—urban, suburban, and interurban—has likewise passed into the hands of the Standard Oil Group.

Banking and life insurance have long been controlled by this same body of men. In respect to the former they have the active assistance of the U. S. government, the utilization of its reserve and the opportunity to speculate upon all its financial transactions. Indeed the control which this group exercises over all political institutions is a most striking exemplification of that marvelous sentence in the "Communist Manifesto" which tells us that "the government of the modern state is but a committee for transacting the common affairs of the capitalist class." If Tom Lawson's statement is to be believed, and he has never yet been contradicted on this point, H. H. Rogers was able to show a statement signed by a majority of the members of the U. S. Senate testifying to their ownership by the Standard Oil Co. The most powerful man in the U. S. government to-day is by no means the strenuous occupant of the White House, but Senator Nelson W. Aldrich of Rhode Island, whose daughter is married to one of the scions of the house of Rockefeller. In the West the state governments of Montana, Colorado and Idaho are but departments of the same Standard Oil trust while the domination of New Jersey and Rhode Island political institutions is no less complete.

If the domination of social institutions stopped here it would simply mean that capitalism was only directing what was rightfully its own so long as the workers permitted capitalism to rule. It is a recognized principle of social evolution that in every social stage the ruling class fashions these governmental and so-

cial institutions in its own interest, and must continue so to do until another class shall have overthrown them.

But The Standard Oil Group has not stopped with the institutions mentioned. It has gone on and set about formulating and directing those institutions which are supposed to especially represent working class interests. It has laid its hand upon the organized labor movement and proposes to direct and control that with the same ease with which it manages the trains upon its railroads, the oil along its pipe lines, the judges upon the bench, the senators, representatives and President, in its political branch. The particular instrument through which it exercises this control is the National Civic Federation. In furtherance of its plan for control of the labor movement of America as represented in the American Federation of Labor it developed the idea of the existence and power and importance of the "public." According to this philosophy there is somewhere in the world a great "third party" to all industrial controversies, which suffers in all strikes and is impartial in all contests between laborers and capitalists. In the organization of the Civic Federation therefore it selects its governing bodies from the three great divisions into which it pretends society is divided, i. e. capitalists, laborers and the "public." Let us examine those who are thus chosen to represent the public. We shall find that the character of these men gives us a key to the understanding of the philosophy upon which the Civic Federation is based.

I have made a careful study of all those who have served as representing the "public" from the time of the formation of the National Civic Federation; including all who have resigned, died or in any way terminated their office, as well as those who are functioning at present.

First is a small class who require little comment, embracing Arch-Bishop John Ireland, Bishop Henry C. Potter, and Chas. W. Eliot. The latter, President of Harvard University, is chiefly remarkable as having the honor to be the first to discover that the scab was the great "American hero." These men are so notoriously the puppets of capitalism as to need no discussion.

Let us proceed to the others: (*)

Grover Cleveland,—President, *N. Y. Life Insurance Co.*

Cornelius N. Bliss, Ex-Secretary of the Treasury, Director American Cotton Co., *Equitable Life*, Fourth National Bank, Home Insurance Co., Trustee Am. Surety Co., and *Central Trust Co.*

*) In making up this information I have consulted the "Directory of Directors" for the cities of New York, Chicago and Boston, the "Financial Year Book," "Who's Who," Moody's "Manual of Corporation Securities" and "Truth about The Trusts," and various other biographical and financial authorities. I have italicized some of the best known "Standard Oil" enterprises. In every case so italicized one of the Rockefellers or H. H. Rogers is a director, or else it is openly admitted that the industry is owned by some "dominating" Standard Oil enterprise.

Oscar S. Strauss—President N. Y. Board of Trade and Transportation, Trustee, *N. Y. Life*.

Charles Francis Adams—Former President *U. P. R. R.*, Chairman Board of Directors of Kansas City Stock Yards Co. of Mo. and director Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co. (latter is claimed to be under Rockefeller influence, but evidence incomplete).

Isaac N. Seligman—Banker, Member Advisory Committee *Stockholders Audit Co. of N. Y.*, Treas. and Director City and Suburban Homes Co., Trustee in U. S. for Munich Reinsurance Co., and Russia Insurance Co. of St. Petersburg.

David R. Francis,—Pres. La. Exposition, Commission Grain Merchant; "Who's Who" says, "Has large interests in corporations of St. Louis, First Vice-President Merchants' Laclede National Bank; "Financial Red Book" says, "Bond Broker, Director Miss. Valley Trust Co.

James Speyer—Director B. & O. R. R., Trustee *Central Trust Co.*, General Chemical Co., German Savings Bank, Member Board of Managers Girard Trust Co., Director Lackawanna Steel Co., *Manhattan Co.*, Trustee *Mutual Life*, Director North British & Mercantile Insurance Co., London & Edinburgh Insurance Co., Director Pacific Mail Steamship Co., Treas. and Trustee Provident Loan Society of N. Y., Director S. P. Co., Speyer Building Co., Underground Electric Railways of London, Trustee Union Trust Co.

Franklin McVeagh—Merchant, Trustee Chicago Penny Savings' Bank Society, Director Commercial National Bank, Commercial Deposit Co., and Fay-Sholes Co. Also an active member of the Chicago Employers' Association and Merchants Teaming Co., which imported scabs to break the teamster's strike in 1905.

Jas. H. Eckels—Former Controller of the Currency, Director Allis Chalmers, Am. & British Securities Co., *Am. Surety Co.* Bankers' Trust Co., Oakland Nat'l Bank, President and Director Commercial National Bank, Trustee Chicago Real Estate Trustees, Director Fay-Sholes Co., Treas. & Director Featherstone Foundry & Machine Co., V. Pres. & Director Hewitt Manufacturing Co.

John J. McCook—Lawyer, Trustee *Am. Surety Co.*, Director *Equitable Life*, International Banking Corp., Mercantile Trust Co., Wells-Fargo & Co. Trustee Sun Insurance Co.

John G. Milburn—Lawyer, President Pan-Am. Expo. He is in the "Financial Red Book," which indicates that he deals principally with corporation business. There is no "Directory of Directors" for Buffalo, where he lives. He is the man at whose house Pres. McKinley died. A strong light is thrown upon his connections however by the fact that he is a partner with

Lewis Cass Ledyard, in the firm of "Milburn, Ledyard & Carter" of N. Y. Mr. Ledyard is described as follows in the N. Y. "Directory of Directors," Director Am. Ex. Co., Trustee Atlantic Insurance Co., Director Boston & Me. R. R., President and Director Franklin Building Co., Director Great Northern Paper Co., Maine Cent. R. R., Merchant's Despatch Trans. Co., Trustee *Metropolitan Trust Co.*, V. Pres. & Director National Express Co., Director Newport Trust Co., & *U. S. Trust Co.*

Chas. J. Bonaparte—Secretary of the Navy, In "Financial Red Book." Is closely connected with Standard Oil Interests in many ways.

Everett Macy—Gives occupation as "Capitalist" in Directory. Director of Am. Cold Storage Shipping Co., Bank of Long Island, Trustee and Director City Club Realty Co., Deutz Lithographing Co., Leather Manufactures' National Bank, Lowe Coke and Gas Securities Co., Oro Grande Placer Mining Co. (A part of the great Standard Oil Mining Trust,—has its offices at 26 Broadway), Trustee Provident Loan Society of N. Y., Director *Queens' Borough Gas and Electric Co.*

Thus we see that practically every member who is supposed to represent the "public" in this organization is not only in fact a representative of capitalist interests, but is a direct agent of the one great central dominating financial and industrial force in American life—"The Standard Oil System." This is the first time in the history of the world that the forces of labor have been committed to the direction of great capitalist interests. It is a phenomenon unique in history and we hope it may be short in duration and never be duplicated.

There has been one branch of the labor movement, however, that Standard Oil has been unable to bring beneath its domination. This is that portion known as the Western Federation of Miners and which is now finding its widest expression in the Industrial Workers of the World. Unable to conquer this body of men by trickery and intrigue the magnates of the Standard Oil declared bitter, merciless war upon them. Just how thoroughly premeditated this war was is shown by a quotation from the Rockefeller controlled "Boston News Bureau" in 1902. This publication, when discussing the Amalgamated Copper Company, spoke as follows of H. H. Rogers: "Mining men in Montana believe that if he secures control of these forces he will be in a position to reduce wages in Montana and make Butte the low-cost-copper district of the world." "These forces" were Heinze and the Rothschild copper interests. Rogers secured control of these forces and the present conspiracy for murder having for its object the railroading of Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone to the gallows and thereby crushing the only labor organization

that has refused to be bought or deceived is but a part of the movement to "make Butte the low-cost-copper district of the world."

At one stage of this war upon the W. F. M. Standard Oil called upon the Civic Federation to play its part and its secretary sent a telegram to the notorious Peabody asking that a discrimination be made between the W. F. M. and the A. F. of L. Peabody at once responded that this would be done.

In spite of this domination of the leaders of the A. F. of L., however, the rank and file of union members have refused to be lead into battle against their fellow workers when the fight was in the open, and one of the most striking signs of the solidarity of the working class that the last century has produced is the readiness with which the Trade Unions connected with the A. F. of L. and particularly the U. M. W. are coming to the assistance of the victims of the murderous conspiracy against the W. F. M. officers. As yet, however, Gompers has distinguished himself by his masterly inactivity, and his profound silence.

A. M. SIMONS.

Marxism or Eclecticism.

What is Marxism? Is it what Marx himself, and those who accept his fundamental statements, say it is, or is it what some who call themselves Marxists, but who pick out at random from the Marxian structure what suits them, say it is?

This seems to become one of the great issues in the development of scientific socialism, which we must meet sooner or later. We might as well take the bull by the horns before it gets any farther.

We must not only keep continually in mind, in what respect Marxism and eclecticism differ, but we must also realize that only one of these can be the logical historical guiding star of the international Socialist Party.

I say "party" advisedly. I know very well that the Socialist Movement is larger than the Socialist Party. No one can pretend to get the "Movement" in line with Marxian thought. So long as the movement stays outside of the party, it constitutes a host of sympathizers, who may or may not be Marxians. They may have many reasons for staying out of the party which we must respect. But at any rate, they have no direct influence on the development of the party, least of all its intellectual development. They do not lead, they follow the party.

So much for the "Movement". But the party is the directing element of the historical process in present society. It at least can and must have a definite course to steer, if it would be the consciously directing force of social evolution. It must be united on this course and steer it with the unanimous consent and co-operation of the overwhelming majority of its members. Otherwise it will be dashed against the rocks of historical failure, and the social process will drift into other channels than those of proletarian emancipation from class rule.

Of course, I do not think for a moment that this eventuality can ever take place. If the Marxian method is reliable—and I have the scientific conviction that it is—then the great majority of the members of the Socialist Party must always be class-conscious proletarians, and this must insure inevitably the predominance of Marxian thought in the Socialist Party.

Nevertheless, the growth of eclecticism may seriously interfere with the normal development of the proletarian majority into clear Marxian thinkers.

There is a great deal of uncleanness in our ranks as to what constitutes Marxism, what is its relation to the Darwinian

theory of natural selection, to the theory of evolution in general, and to the theory of understanding formulated by Josef Dietzgen as the keystone of the proletarian conception of the universe.

The Marxian theories of surplus-value, of the class-struggle, of historical materialism, and Josef Dietzgen's theory of understanding, are inseparable. They dovetail into one another and form one connected line of reasoning, which clearly reflects the historical process. Tear out any of these links, and you break the continuity of Marxian thought and lose the thread of historical development.

The materialist conception of history is the logical fundament of Marxism. Marx, Engels, and Dietzgen arrived at its conception by way of philosophical materialism. Once that Marx had recognized that "the mode of production of the material requirements of life determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual life," and that the transformation of the mode of production was the cause of social revolutions, the theory of class-struggles was the inevitable corollary. And in order to find the compelling motive of the productive process, Marx analyzed this process, found that capitalist production was carried on solely for the sake of profit, and that this profit consisted overwhelmingly of surplus-products stolen from the laborer in the process of production. Therefore the interests of the laborer and the capitalists are diametrically opposed, therefore the class-struggle of the proletariat against the capitalist class, therefore a political revolution as the result of the industrial revolution, therefore proletarian thought antagonistic to bourgeois thought. But if economic conditions shape the thought of men so forcibly as to compel them to a definite line of political action, then it must be shown that the whole human *soul life* is indeed nothing but a response to material stimuli, and not only to economic stimuli, but to all stimuli coming from the social, terrestrial, and cosmic environment. Josef Dietzgen's theory of understanding does that. Thus Marx-Engels and Dietzgen join hands as philosophical materialists. But class-struggles in human society, thus brought about by material stimuli on human brains, are but a human portion of the struggle for existence, which runs through the whole of the universe. This leads inevitably to an acceptance of the general theory of evolution. So it is evident that not only the three fundamental theories of Marx and Engels dovetail into one another and into Dietzgen's theory of theory of natural selection and the Spencerian theory of universal evolution.

This is the actual condition of the matter. Its result is materialist monism as a conception of the universe, with the class-conscious proletariat as the historical champion of this universal monist science. For I shall presently show that there

is no other consistent monism but proletarian monism. Marxism is an inseparable part of this science, and its three fundamental postulates, the production of surplus-value by exploited wage-workers, social evolution through class-struggles, and the materialist conception of history, make this science strictly a proletarian one, so long as the modern class-struggle will rage. Of course, to the extent that the evolution toward socialism continues, this monist science will gradually become the accepted guide of a greater and greater portion of mankind, until the inauguration of the co-operative commonwealth of the world will make materialist monism the light of this world and replace theological religions and metaphysical ethics.

Marxism is uncompromisingly opposed to all that is bourgeois, or capitalistic. Marx and Engels bristled up at the mere suspicion that anything which they said or did was in any way suggestive of bourgeois antecedents. And this aversion on their part was not a mere reaction against the narrow hatred of the bourgeois for the proletarian, but the scientific understanding that all proletarian thought is necessarily and irreconcilably opposed to all bourgeois life.

On the other hand, some of our eclectic comrades are as reluctant to acknowledge and proclaim the existence of this chasm between proletarian and bourgeois thought, as a class-conscious proletarian is naturally eager for an emphatic declaration of this fact. I am not speaking here of those comrades, who join the socialist party or movement for sentimental or other reasons which are anything but an acceptance of Marxism. Of course, I combat the metaphysical idealism of these comrades. But these, at least, do not claim to be Marxians. They are frankly opposed to Marxism and want to shift the entire socialist movement to a new idealist foundation. They are really harmless, because there is no danger of their ever being taken seriously by the class-conscious proletariat. When I speak of eclecticism, I refer to those comrades who call themselves Marxians, or scientific socialists, yet reject most of the fundamental demands of Marxism as conceived by Marx and Engels.

We have seen two illustrations of this tendency quite recently in the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* for October, 1905. Comrade Marcus Hitch there declares that the "gist of Marxism" consists for him in the "political doctrine" of Marx, but that he does not agree with the founder of scientific socialism so far as materialism and economics are concerned. In other words, according to Marx, the gist of Marxism consists of the philosophical, economic, and political conclusions resulting from the Marxian theories. But according to comrade Hitch, the gist of Marxism consists in what Hitch chooses to pick out of the Marxian thought. Not enough with this eclectic procedure,

wants to learn anything about materialist monism. We shall presently see that this takes him still farther away from Marxism.

Is Hæckel really such an unbiased scientist that a proletarian may be excused for following him rather than Dietzgen? If he is, then Bax may find a good many followers. If he is not, then the class-conscious proletariat will prefer to follow Dietzgen rather than Hæckel and Bax.

Let us first take issue with Bax. Historical materialism is the logical application of the method of modern philosophical materialism to social evolution. It looks upon man as a being which is for the present the last product of natural selection in the development of animal life on earth, the outcome of an interaction between the cosmic, terrestrial, and social environment. This social environment has been created out of the natural environment by means of the human brain function, a function which philosophical materialism regards as a product of universal evolution, the same as man himself, and which historical materialism declares to be prominently influenced by changes in the economic conditions. This is the Marxian conception, elaborated by Dietzgen, and explicitly endorsed by both Marx and Engels. Any random selection of any of these essential elements, and the repudiation of the others is not Marxism, much less the gist of Marxism.

This shows at the first glance that neither Marx nor Engels have ever claimed that human thought life is exclusively evolved out of the economic environment. They claim merely that the general trend of human thought is predominantly influenced by economic conditions. Yet Bax intimates that the materialist conception of history, or, as he calls it, the economic interpretation of history, attempts to "evolve the manysidedness of human life out of one of its factors." And he comes to the startling conclusion that the materialist conception of history, beg pardon, the economic interpretation of history, as a method of historical research, "presupposes in an advanced society an inequality of economic conditions, the existence of classes, or, in other words, the private holding of property." That is to say, the economic interpretation of history, according to Bax, cannot be used to explain the scope of thought life in primitive societies, or in the co-operative commonwealth. One is dumbfounded on reading such an assertion, when one remembers that it is precisely the economic interpretation of history which in the hands of Marx, Engels, and Lewis H. Morgan revealed the nature of primitive societies, demonstrated the origin of class societies, and gave a forecast of social evolution toward socialism.

I wish Comrade Bax would tell us clearly just what is the essential difference, in his opinion, between the economic inter-

pretation of history and the materialist conception of history, and who is, according to him, the author of the economic interpretation of history. At present there is a decided vagueness in all his criticisms, for no one can exactly tell against whom or what these criticisms are directed. I wish he would tell us plainly whether he is criticising the Marxian materialist conception of history, especially its application by Marx and Engels themselves, whether he is merely criticising the extreme application of Marx's theory by some of his impossibilist followers, or whether the "economic interpretation of history" of which he speaks is something entirely different from the Marxian materialist conception of history. I know that others, for instance Enrico Ferri, prefer the term economic determinism and use it synonymously with historical materialism. But I don't know whether Comrade Bax regards these terms as identical, and I for one should like to know "where I am at" when I am reading the Baxian writings.

If his criticisms are aimed at the materialist conception of history as originated and applied by Marx and Engels,—and a good many passages of his writings certainly read as though they were so directed—then he completely misinterprets the purpose and bearing of that theory. That he does not apply it logically, is amply proved by some of his writings. And for this reason we need not wonder that he takes exception, in a more recent issue of *Neue Zeit*, to Dietzgen's proletarian philosophy. A man who can explain a part of history by materialist, and another part by materialist methods, will find nothing strange in explaining the function of a proletarian brain partly by bourgeois and partly by proletarian methods, or perhaps entirely by bourgeois methods.

Haeckel's monism, which Bax prefers to the proletarian monism of Josef Dietzgen, is not a consistent monism. Proletarian monism takes into account all "the many-sided factors of human life," while Haeckel's monism tries to exclude from a scientific analysis of this life the historical claims of the proletarian factor. While Bax vaguely accuses some one—I don't know whom—of applying the "economic interpretation of history" too narrowly, Haeckel does not apply it at all. No sooner is Haeckel asked to go to the logical conclusion of his so-called monism and apply the idea of natural selection to the class-struggle, than he ceases to be an unbiased monist and feels himself as one of the "noblest and best," a member of the ruling class. He operates brilliantly with the materialist conception of animal history in general, but declines to have anything to do with the materialist conception of the history of the human animal in particular. The ridiculous inconsistency of this sort of "monism" has never come home to him. Yet in spite of this

human mind as a part of universal evolution is inseparably connected with the proletarian revolution. But Haeckel's monism, being a bourgeois monism, will never admit or understand this, and therefore it remains metaphysical and imperfect as a science. Proletarian monism, on the other hand, is a consistent and perfect science of natural development and excludes the last vestiges of metaphysics.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The proof of science (including scientific philosophy) is in the testimony of historical evolution. The Marxian theories stand vindicated by fifty years of proletarian development. And with the advance of the proletarian revolution, the necessity and scientific truth of Dietzgen's theory of understanding stand out in ever bolder relief.

When bourgeois schools will teach proletarian revolution and admit proletarian teachers on the same terms as bourgeois teachers, then it will be time enough to admit that the thinkers of the ruling class are unbiased scientists. Until then I shall prefer to trust to proletarian science. For my part, I am not afraid of losing the ground from under my feet, if I do not continually seek for points of contact with bourgeois thought. The historical development takes good care, through the presence of ruling classes, that we do not get away from bourgeois ideas. And it is not in the least necessary that some of our good comrades should be everlastingly adulterating our clear proletarian bugle calls by their hybridization of bourgeois and proletarian ideas. Instead of weakening and confusing our movement by their semi-bourgeois meandering, they had better help us to beat a few new ideas into the dull bourgeois brains.

At any rate, I rely on a majority of class-conscious and thoroughly revolutionary proletarians as the only trustworthy bulwark against the corrosive effect of an eclecticism, which, if it is not an echo of bourgeois dreams, is certainly permeated by the mist of metaphysics and is too vague and vacillating to point the way unerringly to the culminating point of the proletarian revolution.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

The Land of Graft.

One of the first acquaintances we made after pitching our summer camp beside one of the beautiful streams in northern Indian Territory was Don Murphy. Mr. Murphy was a queer mixture of Scotch-Irish and Cherokee. He possessed the industry of the Scotch, the wit of the Irishman and the love of nature of the Indian, coupled with the culture acquired at Indian schools, making him a most agreeable companion.

One day we were discussing matters of government and the subject of corruption among public officials was broached. It proved to be Don's hobby, and as he was unusually well informed he told us many a thrilling tale of graft and the grafters.

"Graft! graft! What do you know of graft? You have never lived in Indian Territory," he cried with flashing eyes and face expressing intense disgust. "There may be bigger grafters in the cities, but there are more of them in round numbers in Indian Territory than in all rest of the United States combined. Why the whole history of the Cherokees from the signing of the treaties by bribed misrepresentatives, down to the enrollment of the last papoose is one long tale of graft and grafters large and small. You have read a lot about the immense sums of money expended on the lazy Indian by the Government, but mark my words, the Indian has received little but red tape and the grafter has come in for the rest. What was not absorbed between Washington and the Agency by the big grafters was quickly gobbled up by the little ones after it arrived. You have heard that 'For the ways that are dark and tricks that are vain, the Heathen Chinees is peculiar,' but don't believe it ma'am, don't believe it, an Indian Territory grafter would give the wiliest Chink that ever batted a bias eye, a whole sleeve full of aces and beat him every game."

Thinking to turn our conversation into a more pacific channel I mentioned our intended trip to the capital city of the nation in the near future and spoke of the usual beauty of the town, its air of prosperity, splendid homes and well kept lawns. "But what maintains your town?" I asked, "I can't understand how so beautiful and prosperous a town exists without some sort of industries or means of support. What class of people are its inhabitants?"

"Grafters ma'am, grafters, every one but a few women who do the grafters' washing and a few who curry their horses and care for their lawns." "Oh! But there must be some legitimate

business men," I expostulated, "you are unjust." "Well possibly ma'am, but they are scarce as hens' teeth, scarce as hens' teeth. There are a few legitimate business men in the Territory but they are the new comers and men of small means. The men who not yet learned how much easier it is to make a living by grafting than by business, and how flowery the path of the grafter is made, or the men who are naturally too honest to ever be anything but poor."

Thinking perhaps Mr. Murphy's aversion to the grafting fraternity might have caused him to exaggerate I decided to investigate the matter, and far from finding an exaggeration, I found it just about as impossible to overdraw the situation as to exaggerate in painting a rainbow.

In discussion the Indian question the important fact is always overlooked that the Indian belongs to one evolutionary stage of society and the white to another. Most Indian Territory tribes belong to that barbarian, fraternal order in which the ancestors of the white men existed before the introduction of the slave economy, not savages, but not yet civilized. The white race has passed through the slave system, Feudalism, and a few hundred years of capitalism since that pre-historic period, occupying many thousand years in the journey. Since civilization is but the slow process of evolution it is but natural that we should have failed to pick the Indian up out of barbarism and land him at one leap into civilization. It took some thousands of years for the Anglo-Saxon to reach our present civilized state and it is the height of presumption and folly for us to expect the Indian to reach it in a few decades.

Lacking the experiences of the white man it is but natural that he should lack his characteristics also. The Indian is not fond of work for in his natural state such labor as civilization demands was not necessary. He has no ancestry of slave, serf and wage-worker behind him to produce the tendency and ability to labor. He is not a business man for trading was unknown and unpracticed within the tribe. He is a little hazy in his ideas of private property for in the tribe there was no such thing as "mine and thine," everything was owned and shared in common. He may even get tangled up in the meshes of the law now and then, for laws and lawyers were an unperpetrated evil in his stage of society. The Indian is neither the "Noble Red Man of the forest," the angelic hero sentimentalists are wont to rave over, or the blood thirsty thief and murderer he has been painted. He is just a man in the childhood of the race as our ancestors were, just a little parcel of the fargone past, ruthlessly tossed into the hustling present and as a natural result he does not fit into the ways of the white man, hence is being trampled out of existence.

of clear sparkling streams and magnificent forests. A land where flowers bloom and luscious fruit grows by the wayside, and underneath it all, great beds of coal, reservoirs of oil and lakes of asphalt.

The Indian is not a farmer and the government has utterly failed to induce him to till his fertile soil; he has no use for coal, does not need oil and prefers plain dirt to asphalt. He is possessed of great wealth but in a form for which he cares nothing, and since the passion for barter, the greed for gain is lacking in his make-up he falls a ready prey to the white man who has over run his land.

The treaties with the Indians like all laws and legal documents were written by lawyers and naturally they are so obscure and far fetched in construction as to be unintelligible to the lay mind and must perforce be untangled from their legal verbage by one of the profession, so lawyers enter on the ground floor in the land of Graft and have proven past masters of the art. The unlimited opportunities for the Indian Territory lawyer to turn an honest penny is quite beyond the comprehension of the average mind. Naturally the real, large, luscious plums fall to the lot of the favored few, the real aristocracy of Grafterdom, the lawyers with a pull with government officials "higher up." The fee of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars paid one firm of attorneys for representing a tribe before the Department of the Interior is one example and there are many more quite as striking. Then there are the lesser lights who do not come in on the "big things" but who manage to find lucrative occupation without delving very deeply into musty law books. Great corporations have come to Indian Territory to bring the stores of unlimited mineral wealth from beneath the earth and there are many negotiations between the corporations and the Indians which means fat fees for the lawyers.

The Grafting fraternity is a great, powerful machine, resembling in many ways the political gangs or rings of cities. First come the "Big Bosses" possibly five or six in number, each Nation having its own, they are always lawyers, sometimes bankers also and heir to the juiciest plums because of influence with Government officials. Then comes the sub-bosses who are either bankers or lawyers and so distributed that all the territory is covered. Next the small fry of petty officials and small business men and last the little fellow who is always a half-breed and acts as go-between. These are necessary because of the Indian's suspicion of his white brother and strong tribal feeling.

When some corporation casts a longing eye on a good vein of coal or rich oil prospect on the allotment of an Indian its representative does not go to the Indian and make an offer. Oh! No! Not at all. First it would be useless, the Indian would

A Pioneer of Proletarian Science.

TO LAY bare the historical roots of Marxism means to uncover the rootless theories of those who claim to have outgrown it. The furies of private interest, who are stirred by every discussion of the question of private property, are responsible, on the field of economic science, for a spectacle which would be impossible on any other scientific field. A professor of natural history, who would revert from Darwin's theory of natural development to Cuvier's catastrophic theory, would be met by universal ridicule. But a man who turns back from Marx to Adam Smith or Kant is deemed as worthy of laurels in advance of the fray as a general who takes the field against the Chinese boxers. And yet all the confusion which poses nowadays as brand-new wisdom has been sifted and cleared as long ago as the forties of the nineteenth century by Marx and Engels. "No matter how many phantastic dummies' of *orthodox Marxists* are put to the sword, in fortunately bloodless encounters, for the enjoyment of patriots and philistines, the field is ultimately held by the only *orthodox Marxist* that ever was, namely, the historical course of things."

Thus wrote Franz Mehring in the summer of 1901, in his preface to his edition of the "Posthumous Writings of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels." But a little more than four years of capitalist development have demonstrated that he had too good an opinion of bourgeois science. For in the meantime we have seen official spokesmen in capitalist universities repudiating the Darwinian theories and reverting to the Mosaic theories of creation, without encountering either great ridicule or strong opposition. We have seen theological dabblers in natural science openly supported or seriously discussed by "great authorities" in natural science. We have seen metaphysics and theology fastening themselves like a plague upon science and trying to revive the golden age of medieval scholasticism. And yet all this is but another proof that the historical course of things upholds the theories of Marx and Engels. Official bourgeois science, like all bourgeois intelligence, is on its declining curve, because the industrial basis of capitalism is disintegrating.

So much more does the revolutionary proletariat feel the need of a reliable science and realize that science from the point of view of the proletariat, proletarian science, is the only safe-

just dues. Karl Marx was the first to formulate in a general way the theory of historical materialism and to apply Darwinian principles to society by culling the natural kernel from the mystic shell of Hegelian evolution. Dietzgen proved the correctness of this general theory by demonstrating beyond peradventure the material origin and nature of the faculty of thought, thereby completing the explanation given of this faculty by modern biological psychology, and applying the very ultimate conclusions of his discovery with unflinching consistency.

It is this discovery of Dietzgen's which gives the death, blow to all metaphysical and dualistic thought. Once that we have grasped the import of his work, we are armored against all attacks of reactionary speculation.

Thanks to Joseph Dietzgen, we can apply the historical materialism of Marx with perfect understanding and with a conviction of its irrefutable truth. A proletarian armed with the intellectual weapons of Darwin's natural selection theory, Marx's historical materialism, and Dietzgen's theory of understanding, can approach every phenomenon in society and nature with scientific objectiveness and precision.

And if the spokesmen of modern bourgeois philosophy prate learnedly of the *Passing of Materialism*, and if some bourgeois parrots in the socialist movement echo their glittering generalities, with an air of pronouncing the latest scientific truths, it is due to the work of these three revolutionary thinkers that we are enabled to reply: "Speak for yourselves! We know your tune, and we also know why you are singing it. There was a time when you used to sing another tune, which you called the *Passing of Socialism*. Now that the facts have proved your ignorance of social development, you have taken up the new tune of the *Passing of Materialism*. This tune is true enough so far as you and your class are concerned. Among you, the passing of materialism, that is to say, the passing of an uncompromising adherence to scientific induction and experiment, is but a reflex in your mind of the *Passing of Capitalism*. But scientific materialism has found a strong and young champion in the rising proletariat, and the *Coming of Socialism* means the *Coming of Scientific Materialism* and the *Passing of dualistic Theology and Metaphysics*."

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

An Example of Strength.

IN a recent number of this REVIEW the writer made a statement that perhaps appeared as an exaggeration. It was said that the Bohemians in Europe have a grand socialistic movement. Little is known of the Bohemian nation in America, even among the socialists, and it is therefore but natural that still less is known of the Bohemian socialistic movement. And yet the organization of class-conscious proletarians among the Bohemians is relatively as strong, if not stronger than that of any other nation. As an example of this strength the statistics of one single election-district (*Wahlbezirk*) may be cited. Of course, I mean one of the districts of the fifth curia. The curiat-system still exists in Austria, and Bohemia has 18 districts of the fifth curia where the working-class has the right of suffrage.

During the 6th and 7th of January the socialistic organizations of the 2nd election-district of Bohemia held their annual-conference in the small town of Krocehlavy. This district is usually known under the name of Kladno, a great industrial center near Prague, the capital of Bohemia. But it comprises also quite a number of agricultural counties. It is simply a sample of the skillful election geometry of the Austrian government, which, trying to check the growing power of Social Democracy, always combined the reactionary agricultural districts with industrial centers into one election-district in such a manner that the agrarian element outnumbered the industrial workers, for the time being at least. But the conference just mentioned proved that the policy of the Austrian government in the long run must meet with a failure. Even the rural districts cannot resist the educational propaganda of Socialism.

The social Democrats of Kladno, seeing that they must organize the agricultural workingmen if they are to meet with any degree of success at all, went to work and carried on a campaign of education among the ignorant workers of their district, and the results of their work speak for themselves, commanding the admiration of every socialist. The fruits of this labor are embodied in an annual report submitted to the conference in Krocehlavy. Our party organ of Kladno, *Kladno*, says of the conference: "A human pen hardly can picture the grandness of the conference of the second election-district of Bohemia. This was not a mere conference, it was a great demonstration. A

demonstration of our greatness and our strength. A demonstration of the red second district—a demonstration of the reddest and most important district of the Bohemian Social Democracy. It was a triumphant conference.”

These words are no hollow phrases, no foolish self-praise. The Social Democrats of the second district of Bohemia are justified in using such terms. The work they have done within the space of a few years is of such a nature that it can serve as an example even to us, the Socialists of America.

According to the report submitted to the conference the Social Democrats have an organization in 195 communities of the district. And since the district has in all but 208 communities and towns, only thirteen unorganized municipalities remain. Politically, 11,371 men and 1,170 women are organized. This gives us a total of 12,541 organized persons in a population of about 350,000.

Our comrades in Europe, whenever possible, organize also turners' societies. This district has sixteen of these societies with 824 men, and 26 women.

In speaking of the organization of the working classes we cannot overlook the trade union organization which in Europe, especially in Bohemia, is closely connected with the socialistic movement. The figures for the second district of Bohemia are as follows: 12,040 men, and 376 women. The so-called all-union organizations (comprising a membership of different trades), educational and mutual benefit societies, all socialistic, have a membership of 4,352 men, and 175 women.

Workingmen's co-operative concerns also deserve to be mentioned. There are eight of them with a membership amounting to 1,452.

In those thirteen communities where the Social Democrats have no political organization they have educational societies so that in fact the whole district is in their hands.

The socialists of the district have their representatives in a number of city and town councils. Altogether they have in this single district 109 aldermen. It may also be said that lately quite a number of aldermen and even heads of the different communities are beginning to join the socialists' organization, although originally they were not elected on the socialist platform. Of course, our comrades are mighty careful in admitting these people into the organization. No mere office-seekers are allowed to come into the party.

The unceasing educational campaign and merciless warfare waged on capitalism is also apparent in the following figures: The comrades of the district have held 93 open air meetings (6 forbidden by the authorities), 402 public meetings (20 forbid-

These figures, showing the strength of organization in one single election district, certainly fully substantiate the statement that the Bohemian socialists have a grand movement. It is only natural that a movement of such strength and vitality protests against a scheme that would deprive it of the right of representation in the International.

CHARLES PERGLER.

Why We Don't Win.

WHAT socialism should have ceased so suddenly to be a subject for jest in our daily newspapers and have lately become a matter of serious though often hysterical discussion in them, and that the socialist vote in the United States should have been multiplied by four in the last four years excites the wonder of some. But consider how economic interest works with the socialists agitator; and the wonder is that our vote grows so slowly, not that it grows so fast. It is said there is plenty of employment now under fair conditions for all able and willing to work. Those who find it comfortable to think so will not be convinced of the contrary. But let us examine what limits employment in business for profit, and then look for some of the counter-acting influences strong enough to make our growth so slow in spite of this.

Change of the tools of production into machines owned by capitalists has brought consequences much more far reaching than the cheapening of things. Since no man can produce all his own necessities, even if he lives in the poorest way, every worker must produce things for sale in the market, or take some share in the community's industries so as to receive in exchange the things he must have to live. The introduction of an improved machine makes his product so cheap that, without this machine, he cannot produce it for the price and live. It becomes impossible for an individual worker to own and operate more and more of this machinery separately; because increasing complexity increases the cost of the machine, and because it is now no longer operated as a separate machine but as a part of a system of machinery in a factory, for which the co-operation of a large number of trained and disciplined workers is necessary. Consequently the occupations of the home and of the individual have been mostly taken into the factory. The individual can continue in his employment only as a wage worker and only so long as it is profitable to his employer. Thus the coming into use of improved machinery has strengthened the control of the capitalist class and extended it over almost all occupations, a consequence of supreme importance; and at the same time employment in all industries in which their money is invested depends upon the sale of the product at a profitable price, that is a price greater than all the wages paid to all those who have helped in any way, whatsoever to produce it.

Therefore the workers must be too poor to buy that which is the product of their own labor. The great quantity of that which their wages cannot buy is vastly more than the capitalists can consume. The surplus of it has heretofore been used to feed and clothe workers employed in building new machinery and developing new resources for production in which the money of our capitalists has been invested. However, good investments are becoming more and more difficult to find; because the organization of business in staple industries is already established, and not only is sufficient modern machinery already built, but production with it is already stifled to an alarming degree by the impossibility of selling the product at a profit. As this commercial and industrial development of our country reaches completion, continued production under the profit system becomes more and more dependent upon a continuously expanding foreign market in which to sell the goods the workers make but cannot buy. But improved machinery is promptly introduced where our goods are sold, so that these nations also become manufacturers with the machine, competing with us fiercely to sell in the still smaller remaining foreign market, the goods their workers are likewise too poor to buy. For the very reason for which it was made; namely, the saving of labor, improved machinery under private ownership makes employment impossible for an increasing number of the workers, because, under the profit system, the sale and consumption of goods cannot increase like the tremendous increase in the quantity we produce with the same labor. The constant presence and intense competition of many workers anxiously seeking employment reduces all workers to an average wage of bare living. These facts are commonplace, and this conclusion the workers ought to be able to see. In every conceivable way it is demonstrated again and again by socialist editors and agitators. Why does it not meet with more prompt recognition by most wage workers?

No change that does not cut off the unearned incomes of the rich can raise the pay of labor to the price of its own product. No change that does not take away the control of our occupations from the capitalists, so that production cannot be limited any longer by the chances of profits for them, can reduce this furious competition among the workers for insufficient opportunities of employment under present intolerable conditions. To any such change, benefiting the workers at the expense of their unearned incomes, the interest of the capitalist class is absolutely and unalterably opposed. Yet millions of working men vote for capitalist parties whose record and avowed policy get them the money and the votes of the rich also. As this conflict of interests grows more and more conspicuous, it is puzzling to think why men do so while their wives must haggle over the price of pork, and borrow to help

socialists intend "that the tools of employment shall belong to their creators and users." Those things on which we in common depend, with which we can work only in co-operation, we can therefore own only as we use them, that is, collectively. What has this got to do with abolishing competition? So far from abolishing competition, it is the only escape from the present private monopolies by which competition is already abolished in the sale of many public necessities.

In its first stages capitalism seemed to justify itself by giving the management of industry to the provident and far seeing, who are always a minority, usually an unpopular minority. Profits have sometimes been little more than the reward of wise forethought and good management. But the incomes of large corporations are paid, at the expense of those whose labor and wise management make them, in dividends to investors who need not concern themselves about anything that tends to progress or public welfare. And this is the essential purpose of capitalism developed to its perfection. By it industry, enterprise, and ingenuity are cut off from hope of their reward. Here is paternalism and the destruction of the incentive in fact.

The purpose that unites us is to secure all the benefits of labor to those who labor. By the same reasoning, each should receive a share the same as his share of the labor. The complexity of the problem of distributing the product persuades many that socialism is impracticable. Capitalism is breaking down utterly in its failure to solve it. And this is the very problem which socialism must solve, for the chief cause of discontent with the present system is monstrous injustice in the division of the products of labor. Surely then we can reasonably be asked how we expect to solve this problem now. Its importance we cannot minimize. But the subject is one of such complexity that no concise declaration has been made to contain completely and accurately the conclusions established by studying it. There is no official declaration by the Socialist Party regarding any proposed change from the usual method of determining the relative pay for different kinds of work now. The worker cannot be given the full value of his labor as a price in his hand. All workers must necessarily help to pay for the improvements in the machinery of production of which each will own an equal share and have an equal benefit. Provision for insurance, sickness, and old age may further reduce his immediate share below the full value of his own labor. But in the benefits of these he would share as he would in the burdens. To determine the relative value to the community of different kinds of work, the free action of supply and demand will be the best if not the only method. But there is no official declaration on this subject, and no individual has the

EDITORIAL

An Exhibition of Solidarity.

The one redeeming feature in the midst of the terrible tragedy which is now being attempted in Idaho is the manner in which it has solidified the working class of America. Literally thousands of protest meetings have been held in every portion of the country. The Socialist Party, the I. W. W. and several trade unions have responded with appeals to their membership. Another suggestive phase of the question has been the response of the socialist press. *The Appeal to Reason*, *Wilshires Magazine*, and the *Socialist* of Toledo all have special correspondents on the field and are preparing to give wide publicity to the facts in the case. Under the continuous pounding of the Socialist Press and personal pressure, Hearst has at last been forced to act and is now using all of his powers of publicity in defense of the miners.

But great as have been the protests so far there has been no sign of weakening on the part of the murderous conspiracy. It must also be remembered that all of this educational work which is being done by the socialist press does not reach the locality from which the jury will be drawn. In a private letter from Comrade Jos. Wanhope, who is representing Wilshire, he tells us:

"Recollect there is no industry here in the wage sense of the question. All this southern part of the state is agricultural and pastoral, the business element being the controlling element, hostile to the prisoners, and influencing the agriculturalists in that direction also. With this community Steunenberg was the whole thing—'best governor Idaho ever had'—genial, kindly and lovable 'Hero martyr', etc., etc. It's natural enough of course in a community of this sort, that has no actual connection with the wage-working classes. Coeur D'Alene is three or four hundred miles north and there is no direct railroad connection north and south. The centre of this state is practically uninhabited—most of it government forest reserve, and in this place at least capitalism has full control of public opinion. If you wanted to take a labor agitator to a place where you could murder him without local protest, no better spot in the country could be found than this region of Southern Idaho.

Coeur D'Alene is coerced and terrorized. The real reason for the arrest of Vincent St. John is that he was secretly organizing the workers there and was having so much success that the capitalists simply had to get him out of the district. I don't look for anything very serious to happen to him, but since getting into the atmosphere of this place, I fear more than I did for the other three men."

Under these conditions it must be remembered that eternal activity and agitation is the price of the liberty of our imprisoned comrades. With the coming of warm weather parades and open air meetings should be organized throughout the United States. These will reach a larger number of those who are ignorant of the facts than the in-door meetings. More important still is the necessity of increasing the strength of the Socialist Party organization and the vote for its candidates. If it can be directly proven that the prosecution of these men is causing a rapid and continuous rise of the socialist vote throughout the country we shall soon see that prosecution cease.

Since the lives of these men depend to a large extent upon the degree of united protest on the part of the workers and the solidified front which they present to this act of aggression, any attempt to divide the forces of the workers at this time merits severest condemnation. It is a time for the sinking of differences of opinion and a closing up of ranks. We regret to notice that in a few places there has been a very evident attempt on the part of both the I. W. W. and the Socialist Party organizations (not to mention the S. L. P.) to utilize the wave of indignation which is spreading among the workers for the benefit of their own organizations even at the expense of the life of our western comrades. This is all the more disreputable in that some of the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor have responded so magnificently to this cause. To use protest meetings, arranged by the United Mine Workers, for example, as a means of furthering I. W. W. interests is contemptible in view of the responses which the United Mine Workers made to the call upon them for assistance.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

, RUSSIA.

From all directions come reports of renewed revolutionary activity and it is generally expected that the first of May will be celebrated by the opening of a general revolt. Rosa Luxemburg, the well known worker in the German Socialist Party, went to Russia some months ago and has been writing the stirring articles which have appeared in the *Vorwaerts*, from that point. During all of this period the German capitalist papers have been taunting her with cowardice, because, as they supposed, she was located in Berlin and was only fighting at long range. Now it appears that for several weeks she had been in a prison in Warsaw and that during the whole period that the German capitalist editors were advising her to show how brave she was by going to Russia and writing her articles there, that she was really doing just that very thing. Should she be executed as has been threatened it would prove a blow to the Russian and German movement, and also to the whole international movement. At the same time, however, it would rouse international agitation and sympathy to a much higher degree than it has ever reached heretofore.

AUSTRIA.

From the *Volkstribüne* of Vienna we learn that the socialists have at last practically attained universal equal suffrage and that they are preparing for the coming election with the certainty of a great increase in the socialist representation in the Reichstag. The great cities under the new apportionment will receive a considerable increase in the number of representatives and they will nearly all be socialists. The law also provides for a measure at least of security against intimidation and the general abuse of the right of suffrage which has existed heretofore. The exact wording of the law is as follows. "Each person of the male sex shall be qualified to vote for representatives who has reached 24 years of age, is an Austrian citizen and is not specifically excluded from the right of suffrage, and who shall have lived at least one year within the community in which he seeks to exercise the rights of suffrage." Some idea of the extent of the change is gained by the fact that under the previous election law, 172 out of 425 representatives were elected by indirect and *viva voce* vote, and that the socialists were absolutely excluded from any voice in the election of these representatives. Furthermore out of these 425 representatives only 22 were elected by universal

Petersburg, whose name we can not give at present, but who has enjoyed remarkable opportunities for observation. From this letter we take the following extracts:

"As to the peasant movement, I expect Jacquesies to an extent and of a character which will eclipse all that history has ever seen put together. I think that this will so transform the situation on the whole continent of Europe, and the attitude of the whole world towards the agrarian question, that we will have to give all our social movements and social ideas a new date from then on. This movement is beginning as I write, and two friends whom I brought over here are down in Rostoff at the present moment watching its beginnings. It will spread north with the spring, but may not come to a climax until next fall, and might even commence with redoubled energy a year from date. Longer than two years I do not consider it could last, as the peasants themselves would be too much starved to do anything whatever. That is not the case at the present time.

"The Siberian army is bringing to the villages the will to revolt. Reservists are returning every day and they will all be back by the first of June (15th, Christian style). About this same date about a couple of million of harvest hands are employed on the big properties of the south. These may strike. Also about the same date the peasants will begin to see that the Douma has met and that there is nothing in it. So I should expect a crisis some time in the Russian June.

"The intellectuals in the cities are not and never were in touch and sympathy with the real proletariat. They were perhaps closer to him than in any country in the world, but now that he has got from them about all he wants I think their leadership has gone. In the country it was different. There the intellectuals were formerly separated by a gulf from the peasants. The new period of liberty after the Manifesto, however, drove the intellectuals to an opportunity which they have been awaiting for a generation. They began a hand to hand propaganda among the peasants. This time it was not the revolutionary element among the intellectuals (perhaps some 10 per cent including the much larger proportion of the very young men) but every physician, writer, lawyer, engineer, etc., in the village. Only the prosperous peasants were left to lead the Black Hundreds, as they have always done. Even these prosperous peasants when they see the revolution becoming sufficiently strong are likely to turn to its side, and even to lead it, as their characters are much stronger than those of the intellectuals and they know the peasant better. My point is, however, that the peasants all over Russia have seen in recent months that the intellectuals are willing to stake everything in the fight with them against the landlords and Government.

"The gold reserve is a fake. All Europe now knows it, but all the big European credit institutions are trying to help Russia out until the Douma meets. When the Douma meets and nothing good results the very last card will have been played and Russia will be on a paper basis within a month or two.

"There are absolutely no resources in Russia the government can rely on in this crisis. Even those mentioned by Kautsky in the *Neue Zeit* are fabulous, e. g., if the Church treasure were touched by the government the effect on all true believers would cost the government ten-fold what it would gain. No, there is not the slightest possible ray of financial hope in any possible direction, except if the people can be held down by a mixed policy of cajolery and repression so that foreign confidence is again restored."

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

Organized labor is at last going to enter politics, according to reports from Washington, where the executive council of the American Federation of labor was in session during the past month. At the invitation of the council a hundred or eighty "labor leaders" participated in the conference, and they all marched over in a body to present a memorial to President Roosevelt and Speaker Cannon, of the House, and Frye, of the Senate. Demands were made that the politicians give favorable consideration to the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills, likewise to restriction of Chinese and certain European immigration. "The friends of labor," as usual side-stepped nearly every proposition. True, they made long prayers, but after they were through nobody could tell just what they had said, other than that they could not make the concessions appealed for. President Roosevelt particularly ridiculed the idea of curbing the injunction-throwing judges and introducing the eight-hour system on the Panama canal. He bemoaned the eight-hour system on the sad fact that the employes on the big ditch usually work fairly well Monday and Tuesday, but on Wednesday and Thursday they become lazy or tired, and on Friday and Saturday only about one-quarter of the laborers are at work. Roosevelt did not charge that they are out getting drunk, but that was the inference; and it didn't dawn upon him that, if the hours of labor were shortened to a maximum of eight at the outside in that climate, in all probability the men would be better able to stand the arduous toil. Roosevelt has undoubtedly had little experience in performing hard, manual labor, despite his alleged strenuousness. He inherited a fortune when he was born and ever since he has fought shy of the exacting and exhausting toil that wastes the tissues of the human frame. Of course, Mr. Roosevelt has tramped about with his rifle in his hands looking for bears, coyotes and other game, and he has also looked wise and talked knowingly about frugality, industry, race suicide, etc., but he has not wielded a shovel or pick-ax to any great extent. So it could not be expected that he had any great amount of sympathy for the poor drudges who die in platoons at Panama. On the contrary, "Teddy's" position on this question as well as the anti-injunction bill, which was introduced to curb the powers of capitalistic courts during strikes, showed conclusively that he was a typical and class-conscious capitalist. Frye and Cannon just as plainly demonstrated the fact that they are in the same category and have no interest in labor matters or desire to even consider them. In plain words, the big crowd of "labor leaders" who had been specially summoned to Washington by Gompers were snubbed openly.

What did the "leaders" do? Did they take a firm, uncompromising stand against the capitalistic politicians who had turned them down with little ceremony? Not they. Marshaled by the "Little Napoleon," they hiked back to headquarters on G street, sent for the reporters and talked

— with capitalism centralizing so rapidly that a little Rockefeller is born with the power of \$5,000,000,000 of wealth in its power, with the trusts and combines in possession of all the great industrial institutions, with their political parties reeking with rottenness and graft, with employers' associations waging pitiless war upon everything that looks like a labor organization, with the drunken plutocracy even going to the extreme of demanding the blood of the Western miners' officials, and with strikes and lockouts threatening all over the country — I say that at just this point of our evolution the labor leaders in and out of the A. F. of L. seem to be going completely daft in their wild attempt to cling to pure and simpledom and rejecting political action.

I have already explained in the REVIEW how, at the Pittsburg convention of the A. F. of L., Gompers ruled out of order two resolutions favoring political action along labor lines. One of them — presented by the cap-makers' national union — proposed that a committee be appointed to investigate and report on the advisability of starting a new political movement, somewhat along the lines, I judge, of the British Labor Rerepresentation Committee. Several weeks ago I met President Mahon, of the street railway employes, who instigated the unprecedented ruling, and inquired what scheme was at the bottom of the unexpected and high-handed move. "To keep the damned Socialists out of the conventions," he replied very frankly. Gompers, Mahon, and their friends ought to have their dearest wish fulfilled. On the other side is the so-called Industrial Workers of the World, the leaders of which body seem to be racing to outdo the A. F. of L. ring in singing the song of pure and simpledom. In their speeches and their organs they sneer at political action — "dropping pieces of paper into a box," and the "Slowshulist" party is coming in for as bitter attacks as the original simperers of the Gompers' stripe ever dared to make. Indeed, active workers in the Socialist party all over the country have suddenly grown lukewarm in the effort to build up a political organization and are enthusiastically proclaiming the advantages of the "industrialism" offered by the wheel of fortune aggregation. Deleon and his dancing dervishes are running amuck and resorting to their old yell that whosoever refuses to join the I. W. W., instantler is a fakir, a traitor, and an all-around scoundrel. And not a few S. P. comrades, who ought to know better, have no hesitancy in mouthing the phrases of that sorry old adventurer. "See," they cry, "nothing has been accomplished in Germany and France and other countries after years of political fighting. Now we must organize industrially and prepare for the general strike. Down with trades autonomy; away with your political tomfoolery!"

Well, perhaps this craze will run its course after some of these enthusiastic brethren get their bumps. And get them they will, sooner or later. I want to make this statement and emphasize it as strongly as possible: The compactly organized capitalists of this country, whether they are in trusts or manufacturers' associations, don't care a rap to-day whether you are organized industrially or on trade autonomy lines. They have been and still are getting together to smash unionism, no matter what form it may take. The miners are on industrial lines and so are the longshoremen. No one will deny that they have not engaged in desperate struggles in the past. But their living conditions are no better than those of the most uncompromising trade autonomists, and they are in for still more hard fights in the future. "We might as well give battle to all the unions at once rather than one at a time," said a leading vessel owner of the Great Lakes. If the bosses are unable to obtain sufficient strike-breakers they will tie up their vessels and starve the longshoremen into submission. That is the program if a strike begins. The mine owners have mountains of coal and can sit back and watch prices go up while the miners

BOOK REVIEWS

COLONIAL ADMINISTRATION, by Paul S. Reinsch. The Macmillan Co. Half leather, 422 pp., \$125.

This is another work that shows how the influence of socialist thought and the socialist attitude of mind is permeating every field. Throughout the work the materialistic interpretation of history and evolutionary attitude is taken for granted. The various problems dealing with the administration of colonies under capitalism, for purposes of commercial exploitation are considered. While the effect of such measures upon the colonies themselves is given the main emphasis, it is the various methods in which these questions expose the workings of capitalism that is of most interest to the socialist leader. He disposes of the "moral" reasons for colonization as follows: "Having forcibly seized upon large tracts of land and established a claim of sovereignty over their inhabitants, the nations engaged in this movement looked for some moral principle upon which this procedure could be defended." In this chapter on education we find him applying the latest pedagogical ideas, for which the socialists have so long stood, and pointing out how essential is the evolutionary and economic point of view in new educational systems. It is impossible he tells us, to directly engraft European traditions upon people in another social stage and whatever form of education is established must be based on the economic needs of the people to be educated.

The chapter on "The Labor Question" is such an exposition of the socialist position on the wages question as one would scarcely look for on a book treating of "Colonial Administration." Here there is a full discussion of the various means which capitalism has been forced to adopt in order to compel people in other than the capitalistic stage of society to produce surplus value. Manifestly in tropical countries, where the workers can obtain a subsistence with very little labor, they will not work hard all day for the same subsistence. Consequently the first problem in every colony has been to find some way to prevent the natives from getting this easy living. In the Dutch colony of Saurinam where the cultivation of the banana afforded an easy escape from wage slavery the natives "were forbidden to cultivate bananas and existing banana fields were destroyed in large numbers." In the Congo Free State the forests which had been the common property of the natives from time immemorial were declared to be private property and the natives were forbidden to gather its products for themselves. In Rhodesia, Natal, Transvaal and other South African colonies a "hut tax" is imposed upon the natives so high that they can not possibly pay it without going to work for the capitalist exploiters. In some of the French colonies "vagrancy laws" have been enacted by which any one not working for wages is declared a vagrant, arrested and put to work. In the Amazon region and in Java a system of "credit bondage" by which the natives are induced to incur a small debt, which is then

for the individual to pass from one group to another, and from the conditions of poverty to a condition of wealth. The common laborer of to-day may pass to the rank of capitalist and manager of business to-morrow." It is almost like a voice from the tombs, even in capitalist writings, which make any pretence of a scientific character, to be told "that thousands become poor even to the slavery of poverty because they do not understand and practice the art of economy." Surely no man who pretends to write a sociology should be ignorant of the fact which has been so often demonstrated that economy when applied to "thousands" simply lowers the standard of life instead of elevating individuals. The trifling discussion of socialism which he gives is only sufficient to show his ignorance of the subject and in his bibliography not one reference is made to a socialist writer. He has no conception of socialism as a philosophy of society and, of course makes no mention of the materialistic interpretation of history or the socialist philosophy of the class struggle. The whole book on "Social Pathology" is based on the idea that poverty in present society is abnormal and "pathological" and not an absolutely essential portion of that society and if we are to use the medical analogy a physiological characteristic. His history of sociology makes no mention of the socialist writers, although he includes several who have stolen all that they have "contributed" to the science from socialist writers. It is probable that this book will become a beginning text book in sociology in many high schools and colleges and as such will supply several thousand students with a lot of information (?) which they will have to carefully unlearn when they get out.

THE WORLD'S REVOLUTIONS, by Ernest Untermann, Charles H. Kerr and Co. Cloth, 176 pp. 50 cents.

In the first chapter on "The Individual and the Universe" we have a vivid picture, drawn from the personal experience of the writer, of a shipwrecked mariner on an island in the South Pacific. With this incident as text, it is shown how even so isolated an individual as this lone sailor would appear to be is united with the closest ties, not only to all mankind, past and present, but to the whole cosmical scheme in the uttermost ends of the universe.

The chapters on "Primitive Human Revolutions" is a simple striking description of the great pre-historic revolutions, both physical and human. Here we watch the dawn of invention and see the beginning of a social institution.

Chapter three, "The Roman Empire and its Proletariat" brings before us the class struggles of ancient Rome. We see the first beginning of working class resistance to tyranny and the mental preparation for the next social stage.

Chapter four is on "The Christian Proletariat and its Mission." This is almost the first attempt to treat biblical history in the light of modern materialism and it throws a bright illumination upon many points. We see the growth of the Jewish people, the economic preparation for the coming of Jesus and the part which he played as a social revolutionist. This revolution was turned aside and its energy exploited by the ruling class under Constantine, "Jesus had transformed the Jewish God of hate into a God of love and a Prince of Peace. The church of possessing christians moulded him into a hideous monstrosity, a God of love who is God of hate and a Prince of Peace who brings a sword.....But the modern proletarian remembers the cross on Golgotha."

Chapter five, "Feudal Ecclesiasticism and its Disintegration": — "The

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

WHAT TO READ ON SOCIALISM.

This is the title of a new book of sixty-four large pages, a copy of which will be mailed free to any one requesting it. Those desiring the book mailed to a list of names must send one cent for each name. It contains full descriptions of all the books published by Charles H. Kerr & Co., together with an explanation of the principles of socialism. We give here a condensed price list of a part of the books that are fully described in "What to Read on Socialism."

STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES.

Uniformly bound in cloth, 50c each, postpaid.

1. Karl Marx: Biographical Memoirs by Wilhelm Liebknecht, translated by Ernest Untermann.
2. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution. By Emile Vandervelde, translated by Charles H. Kerr.
3. The American Farmer, an Economic and Historical Study. By A. M. Simons.
4. The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association. By Isaac Broome.
5. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. By Frederick Engels, translated by Ernest Untermann.
6. The Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky, translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons.
7. Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederick Engels.
8. Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy. By Frederick Engels.
9. American Pauperism and the Abolition of Poverty. By Isador Ladoff.
10. Britain for the British (America for the Americans). By Robert Blachford.
11. The Communist Manifesto, by Marx and Engels; and, No Compromise, by Liebknecht.
12. The Positive School of Criminology. By Enrico Ferri, translated by Ernest Untermann.
13. The World's Revolution. By Ernest Untermann.
14. The Socialists, Who they Are and What they Stand for. By John Spargo.
15. Social and Philosophical Studies. By Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr. (In preparation.)

LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS.

Uniformly bound in cloth, 50c each, postpaid.

1. The Evolution of Man. By Wilhelm Boelsche, translated by Ernest Untermann.
2. Germs of Mind in Plants. By R. H. Francé. Translated by A. M. Simons.
3. The End of the World. By Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Margaret Wagner.
4. Science and Revolution. By Ernest Untermann.
5. The Triumph of Life. By Wilhelm Boelsche, translated by May Wood Simons.
6. Life and Death. By Dr. E. Teichmann, translated by A. M. Simons. (In press, ready in May.)
7. The Making of the World. By Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Ernest Untermann. (In press, ready in May.)

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

Large volumes in extra cloth, uniform stamping, \$1.00 each, postpaid.

1. The Changing Order. By Oscar Lovell Triggs, Ph. D.
2. Better-World Philosophy. By J. Howard Moore.
3. The Universal Kinship. By J. Howard Moore.
4. Principles of Scientific Socialism. By Rev. Charles H. Vail.
5. Some of the Philosophical Essays on Socialism and Science, Religion, Ethics, Critique of Reason and the World at large. By Joseph Dietzgen, translated by M. Beer and Th. Rothstein. Edited by Eugene Dietzgen. (Ready about April 20th.)
6. Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History. By Antonio Labriola, translated by Charles H. Kerr. Second edition.
7. Love's Coming-of-Age. By Edward Carpenter. Cloth, \$1.00.

OTHER SOCIALIST BOOKS.

In Cloth Binding.

- God's Children. A Modern Allegory. By James Allman. 50 cents.
- The Recording Angel. By Edwin Arnold Brenholtz. \$1.00.
- The Voice of Equality. By Edwin Arnold Brenholtz. \$1.00.
- Towards Democracy. By Edward Carpenter. \$2.50.
- The Socialization of Humanity. By Charles Kendall Franklin. \$2.00.
- The Sale of an Appetite. By Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr. 50 cents.
- The Principles of Social Progress. A Study of Civilization. By Jas. Bale Morman, A. B. 50 cents.
- Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalistic Production. By Karl Marx. Translated from the Third German Edition, by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, and edited by Frederick Engels. \$2.00.
- Walt Whitman. The Poet of the Wider Selfhood. By Mila Tupper Maynard. \$1.00.
- Poems of Walt Whitman. 75 cents.
- Rebels of the New South. A novel. By Walter Marion Raymond. \$1.00.
- Socialism, and the Social Movement in the Nineteenth Century. By Prof. Werner Sombart, of the University of Breslau. \$1.00.
- Modern Socialism. By Charles H. Vail. 75 cents.
- The Ancient Lowly: A History of the Ancient Working People, from the Earliest Known Period to the Adoption of Christianity by Constantine. By C. Osborne Ward. Two large volumes, \$4.00. Either volume sold separately at \$2.00.

MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS.

In Cloth Binding.

- God and My Neighbor. By Robert Blatchford. \$1.00.
 Thoughts of a Fool. By Evelyn Gladys. \$1.00.
 Mind and Body: Hypnotism and Suggestion Applied in Therapeutics and Education. By Alvan C. Halphide, M. D.
 The Psychic and Psychism. By Alvan C. Halphide, M. D.
 American Communities. By William Alfred Hinds. \$1.00.
 Gracia, a Social Tragedy. By Frank Everett Plummer. \$1.25.

SOCIALIST BOOKS.

In Paper Covers.

- A Study in Government. By Henry E. Allen. 5 cents.
 Merrie England (Letters to John Smith, Workingman.) By Robert Blatchford. 10 cents.
 Plutocracy's Statistics. Statistical Lies and Liars Exposed by H. L. Bliss. 10 cents.
 Socialist Songs, Dialogues and Recitations. Compiled by Josephine R. Cole. 25 cents.
 Crime and Criminals. By Clarence S. Darrow. 10 cents.
 Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederick Engels. 10 cents.
 The Day of Judgment. By George D. Herron. 10 cents.
 Objectors to Socialism Answered. By Charles C. Hitchcock. 5 cents.
 Life of Frederick Engels. By Karl Kautsky. Translated by May Wood Simons. 10 cents.
 Socialism and Human Nature, Do They Conflict? By Murray E. King. 10 cents.
 The Republic of Plato. Translated into English by Alexander Kerr, Professor of Greek in the University of Wisconsin. 60 cents.
 Socialist Songs with Music. Compiled by Charles H. Kerr. 20 cents.
 Socialism and the Intellectuals. By Paul Lafargue. 5 cents.
 Socialism, What It Is and What It Seeks to Accomplish. By Wilhelm Liebknecht. Translated by May Wood Simons. 10 cents.
 No Compromise, No Political Trading. By Wilhelm Liebknecht. Translated by A. M. Simons and Marcus Hitch. 10 cents.
 Capital and Labor. By a Black-Listed Machinist. 25 cents.
 Manifesto of the Communist Party. By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. 10 cents.
 Katherine Breshkovsky—"For Russia's Freedom." By Ernest Poole. 10 cents.
 The Economic Foundation of Art. By A. M. Simons. 5 cents.
 Class Struggles in America. By A. M. Simons. Second edition revised and enlarged. 10 cents.
 Socialism vs. Single Tax: A Verbatim Report of a Debate held at Twelfth Street Turner Hall, Chicago, December 20, 1903. For Socialism: Ernest Untermann, Seymour Stedman, A. M. Simons. For Single Tax: Louis F. Post, Henry H. Hardinge, John Z. White. 25 cents.
 The Socialist Campaign Book. Edited under the supervision of the National Campaign Committee of the Socialist Party. 25 cents.
 Underfed School Children—The Problem and the Remedy. By John Spargo. 10 cents.
 Forces That Make for Socialism in America. By John Spargo. 10 cts.
 The Socialist Movement. By Rev. Charles H. Vail. 10 cents.
 Modern Socialism. By Rev. Charles H. Vail. 25 cents.
 Principles of Scientific Socialism. By Rev. Charles H. Vail. 35 cents.
 The Kingdom of Heaven Is at Hand. By C. W. Wooldridge, M. D. 10 cents.

THE NEWEST BOOKS.

Dietzgen's Philosophical Essays, fully described in an article by Ernest Untermann in this issue of the REVIEW, is now in press, and we expect to have copies ready before the end of April. It is the fourth volume of the International Library of Social Science, and will be printed on paper of extra quality and handsomely bound, like the other volumes of this series. Read Comrade Untermann's article and you will realize the importance of this book of Dietzgen to any one wishing to understand socialism. The price is \$1.00, with the usual discount to stockholders.

The World's Revolutions, by Ernest Untermann, is just ready. For a full description, see pages 18 and 19 of "What to Read on Socialism," a copy of which will be mailed to any one requesting it. This latest work by Untermann is at once popular in style, original and instructive. His chapter on "The Christian Proletariat and its Mission," should not be missed by any one wishing to grasp the real meaning of the mass of facts brought together by Osborne Ward in "The Ancient Lowly." The price of "The World's Revolutions" is fifty cents.

The next new book in the Standard Socialist Series will be "The Socialists," by John Spargo. We do not often indulge in superlatives, but we believe that this is beyond question the best propaganda book on socialism that has yet been published. It is short, so that we have been enabled to use good type, heavy paper and wide margins and still come within the size of a fifty cent book. It is absolutely clear in its socialism, with not a trace of sentimentality nor of opportunism. At the same time the theory of the class struggle is stated in a calm, scientific fashion that will not enrage the reader to whom the idea is a new one. Lastly, the book is written in pure, strong English that will be intelligible to the uneducated reader and will commend the substance of the book to the educated reader. Every socialist writer and speaker will find the book suggestive for its concise presentation of the socialist argument, but the great value of the book is for the new inquirer who has just begun to study socialism.

Comrade Spargo has given the copyright of this book to our co-operative publishing house. Every dollar received from its sale will go into the circulation of more socialist books. Copies will be ready about April 20th. Every reader of the REVIEW should order one to be mailed on publication. Price 35 cents postpaid to stockholders, 50 cents to others.

THE COMPANY'S FINANCES.

Book sales for March amounted to \$1,090.41; REVIEW subscriptions and sales to \$173.91. The only cash contributions received during the month were 70 cents from J. Feurle, 30 cents from W. I. Angell and \$1.85 from H. M. Wilson. The receipts from the sale of stock during the month were \$292.15.

We need to do better than this in April, for this month we have to meet the cost of moving, which will be heavy. The rent of the rooms on the fifth floor of the Garden City Block, which we have been occupying, has been raised to \$75.00 a month, which is a great deal more than the space is worth, and we have secured larger quarters on the ground floor at a much lower rental, by moving just outside the "loop." Our new location is at 264 East Kinzie street, a little east of State street, and only three blocks from the corner of State and Lake. This is really more accessible from most parts of the city than our old quarters, and we shall have the necessary room in which to grow. Come and see us after April 20th.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

MAY, 1906

NO. 11

The Western Federation of Miners.

AT THE present time it appears that the trial of the officials of the Western Federation of Miners will begin about the first of June. The intervening time should be crammed with efforts to educate the laborers of the United States to the character of the murderous conspiracy which is being hatched against these men.

It is well, just at this time, to sum up the evidence that exists concerning the guilt of the parties concerned that we may be the better able to meet those whose minds are filled with the tales of the capitalist press.

Although the records of the court have entered this case as that of "*The State of Idaho vs. Haywood, Moyer, et al.*," yet if that record told the truth it would read "*The Standard Oil Co. alias the Mine Owners' Association vs. the Western Federation of Miners.*" At the bottom it is a civil, not a criminal case. The object of the persecution is not the punishment of crime, but the increase of profits and the decrease of wages.

In such a case as this the record of both parties is pertinent to the merits of the case. I shall not go back into the story of the Standard Oil Co., but shall deal only with its western representative,—the Mine Owners' Association. Neither shall I attempt to do more than enumerate the crimes of which it is so notoriously guilty that no denial can be offered.

What, then, has been the record of these two parties? During the decade that the battle has been going on between these contending forces it is a matter of common and undisputed knowledge that the Mine Owners' Association has displayed an absolute disregard for all law, justice and decency. Its members

have corrupted elections or defied the will of the voters when corruption did not suffice. The present acting governor of Colorado was placed in his position with a violent disregard of the will of the electors of that state. In other cases legally elected officials, who have not shown themselves sufficiently subservient to the will of the Mine Owners' Association, have been forced to resign at the point of the revolver or with nooses about their necks. Mobs of thugs, "bad men," gun fighters and toughs have been imported to terrorize workingmen who dared to ask for a larger share of the wealth they were digging from the mountains, or some slight improvement in the conditions under which they labored. Miners' Co-operative stores have been looted and their stocks destroyed or thrown upon the streets to waste. Men whose only crime was organizing for the protection of themselves and their class have been rounded up like wild beasts by brutal soldiers and herded in open stockades, forced to work upon the streets with ball and chain, without being convicted, or indeed charged with any crime, and finally deported from their homes and the states of which they were citizens, under the guard of soldiers paid by the Mine Owners' Association. Newspapers that dared to defend the cause of the men so outraged have been looted and their property destroyed. A telegraph and mail censorship was established to prevent the news of these deeds escaping to the outer world. Courts have been defied, when they have not been rendered completely subservient. All these things have been done openly and defiantly, and are not to-day denied by anyone living in the locality where these battles have been waged.

General Bell, who had charge of the militia while they were thus outraging justice and decency, showed his respect for "law and order" by declaring, "To hell with *habeas corpus*, we'll give 'em *post mortems*," while another official engaged in the same work announced his platform to be, "To hell with the constitution." And these are the ones who are invoking the machinery of law in the name of justice.

All this says nothing of the bribery of legislatures to defeat the will of the voters for an eight-hour day, which was the first blow in the Colorado battle. No reference is made to the buying and selling of the states of Montana, Idaho and Colorado as geese are bought and sold in the market, by the warring forces of copper, gold, silver and cattle. Enough has been told, however, to show that one side in this controversy comes into court as Marx has told us Capital came originally into the world "dripping with blood and dirt at every pore."

How about the other side of the controversy? What is the character of the Western Federation of Miners? This is no ordinary organization of labor. This will be admitted at once. To begin with, it has a breadth of character and depth of outlook

unknown to the average eastern trade union. It does not look upon every member of all other labor organizations as interlopers, nor is it even indifferent to their efforts. It is the only labor organization in America that welcomes to its ranks as full-fledged members any man who can show a card of membership in any other union, and who is employed in or about a mine or smelter. No additional admission fee is charged. This union makes no restriction upon output, places no obstacle in the road of any man who wishes to enter the trade of mining. It asks no assistance of the employer in collecting dues, signs no contracts, demands no closed shop. At first sight it would seem to be the "model union" for which preachers of capitalist morality to workmen have long been looking. But we find that this union has another characteristic which, in the eyes of the exploiting class, damns all its other virtues. It refuses to be humbugged, intimidated, bought or cajoled. It insists that there is no common ground between the capitalist and the laborer but a battle ground. The officials of the W. F. M. did not sit at scab banquets with Standard Oil magnates, and so Standard Oil having found it impossible to bribe, corrupt or crush them, seeks their blood.

Worst of all, from the capitalist point of view, they recognized their brotherhood with the working class of the world and joined with them to secure the victory of their class. They refused to deliver their ballots into the hands of their masters, but insisted upon using them in their own interest. They demanded that the machinery of government should be controlled by those who do the work of the world, and that the instruments of wealth production should be owned by the producers of wealth. In short, they recognized the truth of the socialist philosophy, and urged those truths upon their membership. This was the culminating crime that loosed all the bloodhounds of capitalism upon their track.

Yet this acceptance of socialism is in itself one of the strongest proofs that they are not guilty of the crime with which they are now charged. As socialists they impute no responsibility to individual tools of capitalism, such as Steunenberg was. On the contrary, they direct all their attacks upon the system which produces such as Steunenberg. They know full well that the killing of any individual would have no effect upon the great struggle in which they are involved, and they would have been the first to have denounced any suggestion of assassination.

It has been an old rule of fighting tactics with capitalism to impute all its own sins to its enemies. So it is that capitalism, which has reduced present family relations more nearly to a basis of promiscuity than society has seen since the primitive horde, shrieks about socialism "destroying the family"; after having turned men into cogs in a machine it accuses socialism of attack-

ing "individuality," and so on. Consequently we are not surprised to learn that the Mine Owners' Association has sought to cover up its own criminality by shouting "stop thief" at the Western Federation of Miners. Having at its disposal the entire executive and judicial machinery of the community it would have been an easy task for the Mine Owners' Association to capture and convict any members of the W. F. M. who should commit any crime. Indeed conviction under such circumstances would be but slight proof of the commission of a crime. When we recall the frontier conditions of the society in which this struggle was waged, and that every deed of violence naturally committed in a frontier society has been charged against the W. F. M. and that their officials have been arrested literally hundreds of times, and considering the conditions, the character of the work, the society in which the events took place and the courts before which they were tried, it would have occasioned no surprise to learn that a large number had been convicted. But the records show that while the courts are in the hands of their bitterest enemies, and the juries generally drawn from a non-mining population fiercely hostile to the miners, not one single conviction has ever been secured of a member of the Western Federation of Miners for any crime committed in connection with that organization.

So much for past records establishing the natural imputation of suspicion. On the one side we have a band of convicted and confessed criminals,—the Mine Owners' Association. On the other side we have an organization whose principles and method of organization are impossible of reconciliation with murder and assassination. Moreover their record shows that the most merciless and powerfully prejudiced prosecution and persecution has failed to fix the slightest taint of criminality upon them.

In determining guilt the question of motive always plays an important part. Who would gain by the murder of Steunenberg? To be sure some members of the W. F. M. had suffered at his hands. He was the principal tool utilized by the Mine Owners' Association in the perpetration of a series of horrible outrages upon the Miners of the Coeur d'Alene district in 1899. It may be possible that some man who had been brutally beaten or bayoneted by the beastalized negro soldiery at that time, whose home was destroyed, or wife insulted, or who saw his comrades shot down like dogs because they had dared to be men, might have revenged himself upon the man who directed the conduct of these outrages. But the W. F. M. as an organization was little injured by these criminal abuses. The men who suffered in the Coeur d'Alene, and who were driven out from their homes in that locality, became active missionaries preaching the gospel of organization, while the story of their wrongs served but to illustrate and emphasize their preaching. Moreover Steunenberg had been

defeated for re-election, largely through the efforts of the W. F. M. He no longer held any official position, but had become a sheep owner, and was engaged in an armed battle with the cattle men for the right to use land which neither owned, and it is easily possible that he was but another victim added to the thousands that have already fallen in this fight between cattle and sheep rangers. One thing is certain—while he lived he was not only powerless for further harm to the W. F. M., but he served as a shining example of the political power of that organization.

The Mine Owners' Association, on the other hand, had used him and cast him aside. While he lived there was always the danger that he might reveal the criminal secrets of that organization. He might sometime dare to tell the truth concerning the powers responsible for the murders and outrages of the Coeur d'Alene. He could not under any conditions be of any further use to them since he was politically powerless. But if his death could be made to throw suspicion upon the W. F. M. it might be possible to judicially lynch the officials of that organization.

To sum up on this point of motive. Living he was of value to the W. F. M. as an illustration of their political power. He was powerless to do them further evil. He had really done no injury to the organization as such. To the Mine Owners' Association, on the other hand, he was a constant menace while living, powerless to longer serve them and might prove of great value dead if a means could be found to throw the odium of his death upon officials of the W. F. M.

So much for the indirect evidence which might go to show probable guilt. Now for what has been offered as direct proof of the guilt of the men under arrest. This consists almost exclusively of a confession of one "Orchard," who claims to have committed a score or more of murders, including that of Steunenberg, at the behest of the W. F. M. It is pretty fair to assume that a professional murderer is also a liar, and a slight examination of the published portions of his confession shows this assumption to be true, and that the "confession" is a tissue of lies. One of the murders which "Orchard" boasts of having accomplished by means of a dynamite bomb was said to have been committed in San Francisco. "Orchard" described the character of the bomb at length, told how and when it was made, how he placed it in the place where it exploded and who was the intended victim. Unfortunately for the coherency of his "confession" he had not read the later San Francisco papers, subsequent to the ones describing the occurrence of the explosion. Had he done so he would have found that the owner of the apartment house in which the explosion took place, having no particular interest in arranging events to fit "Orchard's" confession, had demanded damages of the gas company, and that the latter, after an examination by

hoods that are being poured into their ears by the plutocratically controlled press of the locality.

The battle, however, is not yet won. Capitalism does not yield so easily. The untold millions which are at the disposal of the prosecuting side of this case will not surrender without a fight, unless it is absolutely certain that a fight spells ignominious defeat. For these reasons there must be no relaxation of effort on our part. As the time for the trial draws near there comes especially a pressing need for funds. To tell a lie, or even to swear to it, is cheap and easy. To disprove it often means long and expensive investigations. This is particularly true in this case, where the nature of the evidence which will finally be submitted in court is carefully kept secret by the prosecution. Up to the present time the sums that have come in have been painfully inadequate to do the work that must be done. It must not be said that these men were murdered for lack of the few dollars necessary to adequately defend them. Such a disgrace must not rest upon the working-class of America. Let special efforts be put forth in the next few days to collect the needed funds. If they are forwarded to the National Headquarters of the Socialist Party they will be promptly transmitted to the proper authorities.

There is but little time now to act. The trial will probably begin the first of June. Every moment between now and then should be filled with agitation and action. Let mass-meeting succeed mass-meeting, with parades and propaganda material telling the truth of this proposed outrage.

No argument, no quoting of law, no preponderance of evidence alone can prevent this legalized, blood-thirsty mob from glutting its vengeance. The only thing that will stop them in their murderous purpose and save the lives of our imperiled brothers is evidence that the hanging of these men, so far from stopping the organized revolutionary movement of the workers, will but give it new impetus. It is this alone that they fear.

It was because these men were socialists, because they were demanding that the workers legally and peacefully through their ballots take possession of the powers of government, and through this of the wealth of the earth which the workers create, that they were feared and hated. Because they were Socialists they were tireless, incorruptible, uncompromising, intelligent champions of working-class interests. Because they were Socialists they recognized the solidarity of their interests with those of the entire working-class. For that reason the entire working-class is interested in their fate. Their battle is our battle, their cause our cause, their murder would be a deadly blow at the heart of every labor organization in America.

For these reasons their lives can only be saved by the action

of the laborers of America. If from one corner to the other of the United States there arises a cry of protest, a demand for justice coupled with the vow that their judicial murder will mean the beginning of the end of capitalism—if the industrial kings of America are made to realize that they will buy the blood of these our fellow-workers only at the price of losing all industrial and political rulership, and with it the opportunity for exploitation of the producers, then our brothers will be saved.

IT IS FOR US TO DECIDE.

A. M. SIMONS.

confined mainly to products indigenous to each, owing to climatic and geographical causes. To-day, the people of California are more dependent upon the products of the State of Pennsylvania, 3,000 miles away, than the neighboring state of New York was one hundred and twenty-five years ago.

To all practical purposes, 80,000,000 people constituting the population of the United States to-day depend upon Chicago for their meat, upon Massachusetts for their shoes, upon Pennsylvania for their steel and iron products, upon New York for their ready-made clothing, upon New England for their textiles, etc. An interruption in any of these industries affects the whole country. The railroad strike of 1894 brought about a meat famine in the East and South, and a coal famine in the West, compelling the shutting down of the factories and mills, not to speak of the shortage in numerous other products, necessary for the sustenance of the people. The railroads have come to be the arteries of the nation, and any irregularity in their operation is as fatal to the life of the nation as an interference with the free circulation of blood in the arteries of a body is to the life of an individual. It is this important part played by the railroads in the economic life of the nation which makes them the object of so much concern on the part of our law-makers, and compels government interference in the affairs of the railroad companies, in spite of the general *laissez faire* policy which is so characteristic of American statesmen.

But, in order to understand the issues involved in the present railroad agitation, it is necessary to review briefly the chief events in the railroad history of this country.

THE RAILROAD CORPORATION.

The first railroad built in the United States, the Baltimore & Ohio, was open to traffic in 1830. In that year the railway mileage of the country did not exceed twenty-three miles; by 1840 it reached 2,818 miles; and in 1850, the year following the discovery of gold in California, it exceeded 9,000 miles.

The decade following this important event in the industrial history of the country was marked by great expansion of the country and its people westward, which was accompanied by a corresponding extension of the railway system west of the Mississippi river. By 1860, the railroads of the United States measured 30,635 miles. Although the Civil War greatly retarded further railroad building, yet the lavish inducements given by the government and the people of the United States to the railroad companies in order to provide continuous railway communication with the Pacific Coast, hastened the completion of the Central Pacific Railroad which reached the Pacific

lations which accompanied the building of these roads would fill a good-sized volume.

In spite of these liberal contributions by the people to the resources of the railroad companies, the latter conducted their affairs with an extravagance that ruined the companies and made their stock worthless. As a rule, the bankers who advanced the first necessary sums were given bonds whose nominal value was greatly in excess of the cash contributed by them. In addition to that, they were given large blocks of stocks as bonus. The promoters usually issued to themselves large issues of stock, which they disposed of to credulous people through whose towns the road was to pass, at very low prices as compared with the nominal value of the stock. They then formed private construction companies which offered to build the road. Acting at the same time as officers of the railroad, they awarded contracts to these construction companies (i. e., themselves) upon extravagant terms. Usually the construction companies were paid partly in cash and partly in bonds, with a liberal bonus of stock, added for good measure. After exhausting the funds in the treasury of the railroad company, they very often left the road unfinished, throwing it into bankruptcy owing to its inability to meet financial obligations. Then as bondholders and creditors of the company, the bankers and the promoters would step in and take over the control of the road, leaving the people out in the cold. Such was the process by which many of the great fortunes were made in the early days of the railway history of the United States. As a concrete illustration of this statement, the financing of the Southern Pacific Company may be mentioned. Although the actual cost of construction of that road was \$6,500,000, no less than \$15,000,000 was paid to the construction company, and \$40,000,000 worth of securities were issued to the bankers' syndicate on account of the money advanced by them. It must be added that these methods have not changed much in later years. The issue of watered stock, i. e., shares whose nominal value is far in excess of the real value of the property of the road or of the capital actually invested therein, has been a regular feature of railroad consolidation as well as of the consolidation of industrial plants in the recent trust movement.

The issue of watered stocks and excessive bond obligations was practiced with a double purpose. First, to attract the credulous "public," i. e., the small investors and speculators who are caught, like fish by bait, by the glowing prospect held out to them by stock exchange jobbers of buying a \$100 share at a low figure, in the hope of selling it later at par or even above par. The money thus obtained from the public goes to swell the pockets of the promoters and bankers' syndicates. The latter, how-

frequent trains than would be necessary if each one had a monopoly of the traffic on its line.

The result of these peculiar conditions is that the factors governing the cost of production (in this case—the cost of carrying goods or passengers) in the railroad industry are subject to somewhat different economic laws than in the manufacturing industry. The greater part of the expenses of the railroad being fixed and independent of the amount of business it is doing, it is apparent that the greater the traffic carried, the less will be the cost of carriage per unit.

The difference between carrying a train, say, from New York to Chicago, nearly empty or full of passengers is so small that it can hardly be estimated. The same number of conductors, engineers, firemen, switchmen, brakemen, station masters, ticket sellers, office employes, etc., have to be employed in either case. The only difference will be in the quantity of coal used up by the engine and that will be exceedingly small, since the greater part of the weight pulled by the locomotive is in the train and not in the passengers carried. It is therefore plain that it will be more profitable for the railroad to carry one hundred passengers at ten dollars each than twenty-five passengers at twenty-five dollars each. At the former rate, the railroad will take in five hundred dollars more, while its additional expense may not amount to one-tenth that amount. The railway manager who has to provide sufficient revenue to meet the enormous fixed charges of his road, seeks, therefore, in each passenger, and in each additional ton of freight an additional *net* income, since the expense of carrying this additional traffic is negligibly small. These few simple facts must be borne in mind to understand the peculiar policy of the American railways that landed so many of them in the throes of bankruptcy and lay at the bottom of the great evil of discrimination which facilitated the formation of some of the most formidable monopolies in the world.

In 1869, four railroad companies, the New York Central, the Pennsylvania, the Baltimore & Ohio, and the Erie established direct connection between the Atlantic coast and the City of Chicago. Each of these roads having enormous expenses to meet, fully three-fourths of which would go on whether the road was doing any business or not, it will be apparent that all of them were very anxious to secure as much traffic as they could. The fact that there were four of them depending on the same traffic made them the more anxious in their attempts to secure their respective share. It is natural that an intense competition should have sprung up among them. When competition arises under similar circumstances among manufacturers or merchants, they will gradually lower their prices until they will come down to the "cost price." Should they go below that point and sell

United States it was thought that best results would be obtained by allowing free play to the natural economic forces, and the building of parallel railroads between the same cities was encouraged in the hope that competition would keep down railway rates.

The railways were the first to learn from experience that unrestrained competition between them inevitably led to bankruptcy and unproductive waste and losses, not only to the stockholders of the road, but also to the community at large which had to pay for it in the end.

The first railway combinations formed were known as "pools." The main object of a pool was to prevent cut-throat competition; the means for carrying out that end differed. At first the pools tried the simple expedient of prescribing the rates to be charged by each member of the pool. The economic forces governing the railway business proved stronger, however, than the "gentlemen's agreements" between the railroad presidents, as they were sometimes called.

Human nature is about the same everywhere, and even great capitalists can not always withstand the temptation of gold. A railway president is confronted by a large shipper of grain, or the owner of one of the gigantic meat-packing establishments by which Chicago startles the world, or a large coal mine owner, who offers to turn over his entire shipments to that one road, if he can get a reduced rate. The railway president may argue with him that he is bound to treat all shippers alike, but the big shipper insists that he is entitled to a lower rate than his competitors because he is going to furnish the road with a greater volume of business,—train-loads at a time—so that the road can really handle his shipments at a lower cost than those of his competitors who may ship only in carload lots, or less. Besides, if Mr. Jones does not care to get his business on these terms, there are other roads which may be more anxious for traffic. Mr. Jones may or may not yield the first time. If he does not, he will find that the shipper really transferred his business to the rival road, which is also represented in the pool. It is possible that the shipper did not get any concession with the other road either, but Mr. Jones, the president of the first road, has no means of finding it out, and when the next opportunity offers, he grabs the chance and allows a *secret rebate* to the big shipper. Once the break has been made, the big shippers continue to play off one road against another to secure bigger and bigger rebates. Such practices could not, of course, go on very long without becoming known to all the members of the pool. Attempts to collect damages from unfaithful members of the pool through the courts proved futile, as the courts held pools

to be illegal under the common law doctrine against combinations or agreements in restraint of trade.

The railways then sought to straighten the pools by requiring each member of the pool to deposit a large amount of money, which was forfeited in case of violation of the agreement; but even that was not always successful. The next step was to pool the traffic or earnings. That is to say, if there were four roads in the pool, it was agreed that each member was to receive a certain share of the total traffic of that territory in proportion to its importance and the amount of traffic it had been carrying in the past. Each road carried all the traffic that was brought to it, but at the end of the year, the roads that carried more than their allotted share had to turn over the excess of the receipts to the roads that received less than their share. Under these conditions it was believed that there would be no inducement for any road to reduce rates below the level agreed upon, since the additional volume it would secure from an increased traffic would have to be turned over to the other roads. But even this device did not prove successful, since each road was anxious to increase its traffic, in order to be able to claim an increased allotment when the agreement would be renewed for the following year, and therefore frequently gave secret rebates to large shippers.

It was through this weakness in the railway organization that some of the greatest monopolies in the United States were built up. It is well known that the Standard Oil trust owed its early success chiefly to the ability of Rockefeller to handle the railway managers in such a manner that he not only paid lower rates for transportation of oil than his competitors, but that the excess charges paid by them to the railways were turned over to him by the railroads. The same is true of the beef trust, which still continues to get rebates under the disguise of icing charges, of the anthracite coal trust owned by the railroads themselves, and of several other of the biggest trusts in the country.

RAILROAD LEGISLATION.

While the roads vainly struggled with the rebate evil, the people, especially the farmers and small business men in the middle west, were getting restless. To the old resentment which so many among them nursed against the railroad companies for the manner in which they had been swindled in the early days of railroad organization, was now added the new injustices of being discriminated against when shipping their products to the market in favor mainly of the big eastern capitalists, who were associated in the minds of the people in the West with the bank-

ers and schemers that had robbed them of their railway holdings. In 1873 came the great financial panic and industrial crisis. Prices greatly declined, thus reducing the farmer's earnings. Yet railways continued to be built during the seventies, but the more competing lines there were added, the greater, to the surprise of the farmer, seemed to be the discrimination in rates in favor of the big capitalists and corporations. In their exasperation the farmers began to talk of revolt, which soon found its expression in the organization throughout the West of the "Patrons of Husbandry" or "Granger Societies," which advocated a good many radical measures for the relief of the "common people" from the oppression of the "money power." One of the first practical results of the Granger movement was the enactment of railway legislation by several states in the middle West.

The Granger laws, as they came to be known, had for their object the control of the railway companies with a view to prevent discrimination in favor of large shippers and of large cities to the detriment of small towns. The same causes that compelled the railroad to give the large shipper more favorable rates than to the small, also made it necessary to discriminate in favor of large cities. As a rule, there are several, or at least two, lines entering a large city. In the competition for business the railways reduce the rates to those cities by the process already described. As the loss caused to the railroads by these reductions must be made up somewhere, the small towns and villages located on the line between the cities are made to pay not only large enough rates to cover the normal cost of service, but over and above that to make up for the loss in operating the service to the large cities. This is known in American railway practice as "the long and short haul" charge, by which a merchant residing in a town located, say between New York and Chicago, is made to pay a higher rate for the same article that is charged for carrying it the entire distance from New York to Chicago.

This, by the way, is one of the principal causes which has contributed to the growth of large cities at the expense of the small. Hundreds of cases in this country could be cited in which the railways have caused towns to spring up in the wilderness (incidentally allowing the magnates in control of the railways to enrich themselves by buying land for a song and selling it to the people at "boom" prices), and then wiping them off the face of the earth by the simple device of manipulating the freight rates, first in favor and then against the town.

The Granger legislation aimed to do away with this abuse. But, as the jurisdiction of a state ends at its boundary lines, and all the large roads extend over several states, the latter

found it impossible to exercise any effective control over the railroads, except in some of the minor matters which came within their jurisdiction.*

The failure of the Granger laws led to a strong movement for federal legislation. As the constitution vests Congress with the authority to regulate interstate commerce, the representatives from the Granger states in Congress began to clamor for Congressional legislation for the regulation of railways. After twelve years of agitation, and in the face of fierce opposition from the railroads and their representatives in Congress and in the Congress lobbies, the Interstate Commerce Act was finally passed by Congress in 1887. The law prohibits unreasonable or extortionate charges, discriminations between persons, localities or kinds of freight, and provides for an Interstate Commerce Commission of five persons appointed by the President, charged with the enforcement of the law. Unfortunately, neither the people nor their representatives have the final say about the laws of the United States, as is the case among other civilized nations. The United States Congress or a state legislature proposes and the Supreme Court disposes. No law in the United States is safe until it has been contested before the Supreme Court and declared constitutional. Any law, no matter how important and how much desired by the people, may be abolished if five judges out of nine composing the Supreme Court of the United States declare it unconstitutional.** But not only can the Court wipe a law off the statute books of the country, it can by the peculiar logic of legal casuistry give the law such interpretation as not only to defeat the original object of the law, but to protect with it the very abuses which the law makers sought to abolish.

The Interstate Commerce Act proved no exception to the rule. By a gradual process of interpretation, the Commissioners have been shorn of every vestige of power until they became the laughing stock of the railways which they were supposed to control. For ten years they exercised their power to prevent extortionate rates, by ordering the railroads to lower rates whenever they found a shipper's complaint just. In 1897, the Supreme Court decided that the Commission had no such power, and thereby reduced the Commission to a condition of helplessness. One illustration may give a clearer idea of the present status of railway legislation in the United States than a volume of discussion.

*) Very little in connection with this legislation was done to protect the interests of the working people employed by the railways. They still continue to be overworked to the point of exhaustion and to be slaughtered like sheep as in no other country, with the exception perhaps of Russia.

**) Such was the case, for instance, with the Income Tax law a few years ago.

In 1894, the railroads centering in Chicago advanced the rates on live stock by adding to the existing freight rate a "switching charge" of \$2.00 per car. The live stock dealers, who found this rate exorbitant, appealed to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The latter, after a thorough investigation of all the circumstances and after hearing both sides, found the complaint justified and suggested to the railroads as a compromise that they reduce the charge to one dollar per car. The railroads refused to abide by the decision of the Commission, and the case had to be carried to the courts, as the Commission has not the power to enforce its decisions. Although more than ten years have now been spent in litigation, the case has not been decided yet, and the live stock men still continue to pay the charge of two dollars. This does not exhaust, however, the capacity of the railroads for evil. If the case should be decided by the Supreme Court in the near future in favor of the Commission, the railroads will have to reduce their charges in the future, but if the live stock men should wish to recover damages unjustly caused to them by the railways in the last twelve years, each one of them will have to enter a suit against the railways which may take a few more years to decide, and may cost in some cases more money than the amount to be recovered. Finally, even if the shippers should recover their losses, this will by no means restore the money to the consumers, including the working people, who in the last instance had to pay the railway's extortion in the shape of higher prices for meat. As a matter of fact, the price of meat has gone up from twenty-five to fifty per cent in the last few years as a result of the extortions of the beef trust as well as the railways.

The courts have virtually emasculated the law so that none of the important objects sought by it could be accomplished. The only provision of the law which they sustained was that against pooling. Although, it should be added, the decision of the Supreme Court against the Trans-Missouri Freight Association in 1897 was based not so much on the anti-pooling clause of the Interstate Commerce Act as on the anti-trust law of 1890.

It goes without saying that this decision did not stop the railways in their attempt to control rates by agreement. None of the "Traffic Associations," by which the combinations of railroads came to be known, ceased to exist. The railway rates of the country continue to be controlled by three traffic associations, known as the "Official," controlling the territory north of the Ohio and Potomac rivers and east of Chicago; the "Southern," which includes the railways south of those rivers and east of the Mississippi, and the "Western," controlling the large territory west of the Mississippi river. The "Classification Com-

mittee" in each of the territories mentioned consists of the representatives of the roads covering that territory and prescribes the classification of the commodities. Each road is left to charge such rates as it sees fit for each class of commodities so prescribed. It is well known, however, that though officially the members of the Committee only discuss the subject of rates and refrain from prescribing them, since "that would be against the law," as the secretary of one of the Committees stated to the writer with mock seriousness, the "discussions" lead to a remarkable unanimity of opinion among the members of the Committee so that all railroads actually charge the same rates.

However, the big interests in the railway world were not satisfied to leave the further course of events to any such flimsy arrangements. They realized very well that sooner or later other laws might be passed more stringent in character which might interfere with their freedom of action, and as a result the great railway kings of the United States set about the gigantic task of consolidation of the great railway systems of the country into common ownership by a few interests.

RAILWAY CONSOLIDATION.

The concentration of railway ownership in the hands of a few powerful financial interests is one of the most important elements in the recent so-called trust movement which marks the closing days of the old competitive order and the transition to a system of production on a national scale. It would be an error to regard railway consolidation merely as a result of anti-pooling legislation; the latter no doubt contributed to that end by hastening the process in some cases. But the concentration process commenced long before any federal legislation took definite shape. As has been pointed out above, railways naturally tend to monopoly. But while the consolidation of parallel competing lines has largely been effected in the past ten years, the growth of railway systems may be traced back to the middle of the last century.

Originally, the roads built were very short, connecting nearby towns. In the fifties, the first consolidation of short roads into more or less extensive systems commenced. The New York Central was the pioneer in this movement under the aggressive management of Vanderbilt, who united eleven contiguous lines into one line connecting the City of New York with Buffalo. By a similar process, the powerful Pennsylvania system was consolidated at the same time. This process went on, the stronger lines absorbing the weaker ones. Yet, up to 1870, there was only one road exceeding one thousand miles in length. The panic of 1873, which brought on so many railroad

bankruptcies, facilitated the absorption of the smaller lines by their stronger rivals. Thus, the Pennsylvania road had grown to about 4,000 miles in 1880, and some other systems had grown to similar proportions, but no road exceeded 5,000 miles previous to 1890. The industrial and financial crisis of 1893 had a similar effect as the one of 1873. Several roads went into the hands of receivers and ultimately found their way into the hands of the powerful railway kings. The Pennsylvania and the New York Central lines each approached the 10,000 mile limit, extending their control over railroads west of Chicago.

The growth in length of railroads is thus summed up in the Report of the Industrial Commission: In 1867, only one road exceeded 1,000 miles, constituting about seven per cent of the total mileage of the country; in 1877, eleven roads exceeded this figure, constituting twenty per cent of the mileage; in 1887, twenty-eight companies, with forty-four per cent of the mileage of the United States, were over 1,000 miles in length; and in 1896 forty-four companies or 56.9 per cent of the mileage exceeded this size, and in 1900 this grew to sixty per cent of the total mileage. The process of concentration is still more apparent from the following comparison of conditions in 1880 and 1900: In 1880 there were 2,085 railroad companies, owning 93,000 miles of railway. In 1900, the mileage was nearly 200,000, while the number of companies declined to 2,023; but even that does not give a correct conception of the extent of concentration, since of the 2,023 companies which owned these roads on paper, only 847 companies actually operated their railways, the rest of the companies having lost their independent position and leasing their roads to the larger companies. The full significance of these leases in the process of consolidation will be brought out further on.

The year 1898 marks the opening of the era of tremendous agglomerations of capital in all lines of industry, commerce and transportation, popularly known under the name of trusts. In the railway world, that year marked the first complete recovery from the depression which set in in 1893, and also the maturing of a definite policy on the part of the railway magnates to overcome the difficulties created by the anti-pooling decision of the Supreme Court in the preceding year. While a legislature may try to limit the scope of activity of capitalistic corporations in so far as their policy is contrary to public interests, no body of lawmakers believing in the sacredness of private property can consistently prohibit a capitalist to buy with his money whatever is for sale. Congress and the Supreme Court declared pooling, i. e., agreement of a certain kind between independent companies illegal. It did not nor could it prohibit the stock-

which came near bringing on a panic in the financial markets of the world in May, 1901, in the stock exchange struggle between J. Pierpont Morgan and Jacob Schiff, the two most commanding figures in Wall Street, is a case in point. The settlement of that war illustrates the third method of consolidation now in vogue, known as the "community of interest" plan. Both J. P. Morgan, who together with J. J. Hill, controls the Great Northern railroad, and Jacob Schiff, the head of the Banking House of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, who together with E. H. Harriman controls the Union Pacific railroad, tried to obtain control of the Northern Pacific road. The three roads run parallel to each other from the Mississippi river line to the Pacific coast, the middle road, viz., the Northern Pacific, being in a position to compete with either of the other two.

When, after a hot battle on the Stock Exchange, it became apparent that neither of the magnates would be able to get absolute control over the rival road and a continuance of the struggle threatened to precipitate a crash in the financial world, a compromise was reached by which the control was divided between the two, i. e., each of the opposing parties retained part of the shares of the Northern Pacific railroad, and representatives of the Morgan-Hill group and the Schiff-Harriman group were elected to the Board of Directors of that road. By this method, the three formerly rival roads became unified, not by absolute ownership, but through an alliance based on common ownership, or, as Wall Street calls it, "community of interest." This community of interest extends now to several other roads and marks a new stage in the process of consolidation, viz., *the welding of large independent systems into a gigantic combination which is rapidly tending to embrace the entire railway system of the country.*

Of the 212,000 miles of railroad which were in operation in 1904, the following were either owned or completely controlled by the most powerful railway kings of the United States:

1—Vanderbilt Group (New York Central and allied groups)	21,000 miles
2—Pennsylvania Group	17,500 "
3—Morgan-Hill Group and other groups dominated by Morgan	48,500 "
4—Harriman-Schiff Group	16,500 "
5—Gould Group	17,500 "
6—Moore ..	14,000 "
7—The Pennsylvania-Vanderbilt	4,000 "
	<hr/>
	139,000 "

Thus practically two-thirds of the entire railroad system of the United States, equal to the combined length of all the railways of Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary, France and Great Britain and Ireland, including all the important strategic trunk lines of the States, i. e., those commanding the approaches to every section of the country are under the absolute control of the Six Great Powers of the financial world. The remaining railroads are partly in the hands of a few lesser powers and partly consist of small "feeders" to which the Great Powers have not had time so far to pay attention. It should be added, however, that each of the powers mentioned above has considerable holdings (though not a majority of shares) in the smaller lines as well. The figures given above are, of course, in round numbers, and show the field in which each of the powers is predominant. But, in reality, there is much closer co-operation between them than may be gathered from the above table. Almost each of the powers has a greater or less share in the lines of the other. An illustration of this may be found in the anthracite coal roads. As is well known, the anthracite coal industry is now completely in the hands of the four railroads which pass through that mining region: the Philadelphia & Reading, the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western, the Lehigh Valley, and the Erie.

All the four roads are jointly owned and controlled by the Vanderbilt-Pennsylvania-Morgan interests. How such control is ramified may be seen from the following graphic illustration of the ownership of the Philadelphia & Reading:

New York Central (Vanderbilt),	Pennsylvania,
Lake Shore,	Baltimore & Ohio,
Philadelphia & Reading.	

By the system of controlling one railroad through this ownership of another, the great financiers of the United States have hit upon a scheme of extending their control over vast territories and immense properties without great outlay of capital. This is the way the trick is done: Say, there are five railroad systems, of which A has a capital stock of 100 million dollars, B 75, C 50, D 25 and E 10, making a total of 260 million dollars. A financier like Morgan, with a few of his friends, may own 51 million dollars' worth of stock in road A. Owning a majority of shares, he has a majority of votes in the election of the board of directors, and thereby controls it as completely as though it belonged exclusively to him and his friends. They now start out to capture the remaining roads without investing a single additional penny. A campaign is started first against road B. With the funds in the treasury of road A considerable stock of road B is bought in the market and represen-

tation is secured on the Board of Directors of Road B. Then, by negotiation, threats of competition and promises of good things if they agree to come into the combination, the stockholders of road B are induced to sell to road A 38 million dollars' worth of their stock, i. e., enough to insure absolute control to road A. Very little cash money is required, as the sellers are quite willing to receive in exchange for this stock the shares or bonds of Company A. The same policy is now adopted toward Company C, and later to D and E. With each new acquisition, the process of absorption of other roads becomes easier. Thus, our financiers, with a capital of 51 million dollars, absolutely control roads worth 260 million dollars just as surely as though they invested the entire amount.

This was the way the \$400,000,000 combination was effected in 1901, by which Morgan-Hill and Schiff-Harriman were to take joint possession of the great Western systems, which guaranteed them complete sway and uninterrupted railway communication from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The capitalists dominating the Pennsylvania system secured complete control of the Baltimore & Ohio, when the Pennsylvania railroad bought \$40,000,000 of the \$105,000,000 stock of the Baltimore & Ohio railroad. As the Baltimore & Ohio had already been in possession of the Norfolk & Western, Chesapeake & Ohio, and the Philadelphia & Reading, the Pennsylvania came at one stroke into possession of all these systems when it obtained control of the Baltimore & Ohio. Many other illustrations of the same kind could be given; in fact, the recent history of railroad consolidation is to a great extent a repetition of this scheme.

The grip which the financial oligarchy has upon the life and business of the nation is very strikingly shown in the report submitted by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, just published. By tracing the names of the men acting as members of Boards of Directors of the various railway systems, it is found that thirty-nine men virtually control the approaches to the most important eastern ports on the Atlantic coast, such as New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Boston, and a considerable part of the export traffic on the Gulf of Mexico, such as passes New Orleans, Mobile, Savannah, etc. It is within the power of these men by raising or lowering the rates on different commodities to build up or destroy the export trade of any industry—a power before which that of the United States Government is utterly insignificant.

Adding to this group of thirty-nine men, eighteen more persons, we get a group of fifty-seven persons having similar control over the ports of the Pacific Ocean as well as the Atlantic. If to the above are to be added the few large lines which still remain independent, the total number of directors holding sway

power of control over the export trade of the nation has just been pointed out. Their ability to interfere with the import trade is no longer a matter of theoretical speculation, but has been forcibly demonstrated by the roads in upsetting no less venerable and sacred an institution than the protective tariff. In a recent speech during the debate on the railroad bill, a member of Congress from Ohio cited a long list of articles on which the railroads charged a lower freight rate on goods shipped from Europe to Ohio (including steamship transportation) than they did on the same articles coming from New York and other cities in the United States to Ohio. The difference in favor of the imported article was in each case greater than the import duty provided for in the high protective Dingley tariff now in force. By this simple device the small clique of capitalists in control of the railroads undertook virtually to abolish the tariff adopted by the United States Congress in those industries where they choose. One illustration will suffice. The freight rates on hooks, buttons and hosiery from Liverpool to San Francisco, via New Orleans, is \$1.07 per 100 pounds. For carrying the same articles from New Orleans to San Francisco the same railroad charges \$2.88 per one hundred pounds, i. e., two and a half times as much for a much shorter distance.

President Roosevelt must be given credit for having lent the weight of his official and personal influence to the agitation for government control of railroad rates and for the sagacity he displayed thereby as a statesman who is opposed to government ownership of railways. But for his efforts the bill that has just been passed by the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate would not see the light of day for a long time to come. But as Roosevelt has well remarked (and in this he displayed his political foresight), unless the railroads submit to some kind of efficient government control of rates, the people will sooner or later take over the railroads. This is undoubtedly true, and therein lies the importance of the present movement from the socialist point of view. While government ownership of railways under the present system and without a strong working class representation in Congress can not, of course, be considered a socialist institution, yet the evolution the popular mind is undergoing under the influence of the transformation in industry and transportation described here has a greater educational value in preparing the country for socialism than thousands of speeches and years of socialist propaganda could have. The people are coming to learn that the choice between unlimited private ownership and public ownership is that of a few capitalists owning the nation or the nation owning its industries.

Briefly stated, the object of the legislation advocated by the President is to endow the Interstate Commerce Commission with

socialism can no longer be used by the politicians as a scarecrow with which to frighten the timid voter into indiscriminate support of the old parties.

The change in the economic conditions of the various sections of the country is gradually bringing about a geographical and political displacement of the elements from which the old parties have hitherto drawn their strength. So far the Republican party has found its main support in the north and the Democratic in the south. The Republicans had no adherents in the south outside of the negroes and the few white office-holders who received their appointments from the Federal Government. In the north the Democrats have been in the minority and have drawn their support largely from the Irish and German voters and from a more or less radical minority of the working class. In addition to that they had some following among the exporting and shipping interests as well as the old surviving idealist champions of the doctrines of free trade, state's rights, etc. The chief line of division, hitherto the question of protection vs. free trade, secured to the Republican party the support of the manufacturers and farmers in the north, and the cotton exporting states to the Democratic party in the south.

The decline in prices which accompanied and followed the crisis of 1893-96, and aroused the farmers more than any other class, projected a new question into the arena of political discussion, viz., that of silver coinage. It was the first upheaval that caused a serious strain in the old party structures, which began to give way. It divided the west and the east into two hostile camps, instead of the traditional north and south division. While the south voted solidly for the Democratic party, it was done purely out of tradition and under loud protests of the southern planters and business men. On the other hand, the western farmers, who were mostly accustomed to vote the Republican ticket, suddenly found themselves deserted by their old party and their interests championed by the Democrats. Here, too, there was much voting for the Republican party through tradition, but at the same time a great number went over to the Democratic camp.

The capture of the Democratic party in 1896, by the radical faction headed by Bryan, who advocated a number of measures of special importance to the working class, brought large numbers of workmen to the Democratic banners who formerly voted the Republican ticket on account of its policy of "protection to home labor." Eugene V. Debs, the socialist candidate for President in the last two elections, stumped the country in 1896 for Bryan. Having lost the support of its old-time wealthy supporters in 1896, the Democratic party, under the leadership of Bryan and the western Democrats, has been forced to seek sup-

The Idlers.

Idle within the market place he stands,
Jostled and pushed aside by hurrying throng;
With brooding brow, and clenching, nerveless hands,
A soul enshrouded in its sense of wrong.
Plenty for busy people high and low;
The chink of gold always beyond his reach,
While hunger gnaws, and chill winds pierce and blow,
The human agony that has no speech;
The tragedy that mocks our social plan,
Robbed of his birthright, work,—due every man.

Beside the hearth another crouches down
With sinking heart and dulling sense of pain,
With patient helplessness that meets the frown
Of busy, hustling lives who rule and reign.
A spirit that could soar to eyried height,
A vision that could range horizons bold,
An ear for song stars tuned to sensuous night,
Yet in a century gauging men by gold,
Fettered to earth, galled by a crushing bond,
Useless and blinded, hoping naught beyond.

A parasite that saps and sucks, that clings
To others bounty, caring but to feed
Whether others sow and plant, a hand that wrings
As if by right, what others hoard by greed.
A waif without a country, home or friend,
A life devoid of purpose, seeing naught
But each day's food, and fire, and death to end
The little rounding of his narrowing thought;
Sinking below dumb brutes that drag and plod;
A blot upon the universe of God.

With narrowed brow, and cringing, sneaking mien,
Or loud bravado and half-muttered curse,
And drunken swagger, is another seen,
Who stalls existence with his horse,—and worse,
Feeds on his husks yet boasts his titled line,
Whose name once rang with martial deed or joust,—
A nothing, fit for herding with the swine,
Without a tithe of manhood, but its dust,
Worthless and foul in thought, and speech, and ear,
Whose very breathing taints God's atmosphere.

Mistaken souls, who work life's sovereign rule
Of love,—demand its law, each circling sun,
All things in time and space are yours,—the tool
Within your grasp, or pressing on each one;
The earth is yours, the seed, the germ, the soil,
The dawn, the song, the rain, the seasons call,
God given honor to all honest toil,
And manhood's crown of living, best of all.
We make all wrong. God's plan is just and true,
To make man Christlike means so much to do.
Why, stand ye idle, laborers are so few?

—EMMA PLAYTER SEABURY.

Engels—Thirty Years Afterwards.

(Being an Introduction to the Anti-Duehring.)

WHEN Dr. Eugen Duehring, privat docent at Berlin University, in 1875, proclaimed the fact that he had become converted to Socialism, he was not content to take the socialist movement as he found it, but set out forthwith to promulgate a theory of his own. His was a most elaborate and self-conscious mission. He stood forth as the propagandist not only of certain specific and peculiar views of socialism but as the originator of a new philosophy, and the propounder of strange and wonderful theories with regard to the universe in general. The taunt as to his all-comprehensiveness of intellect with which Engels pursues him somewhat too closely and much too bitterly could not have affected Herr Duehring very greatly. He has his own convictions with respect to that comprehensive intellect of his and few will be found to deny that he had the courage of those convictions.

Thirty years have gone since Duehring published the fact of his conversion to socialism. The word "conversion" contains in itself the distinction between the socialism of thirty years ago and that of to-day. What was then a peculiar creed has now become a very widespread notion. Men are not now individually converted to socialism, but whole groups and classes are driven into the socialist ranks by the pressure of circumstances. The movement springs up continually in new and unexpected places. Here, it may languish, apparently; there, it gives every indication of strong, new and vigorous life.

The proletariat of the various countries race as it were towards the socialist goal and as they change in their respective positions the economic and political fields on which they operate furnish all the surprises and fascinations of a race course. In 1892 Engels wrote that the German Empire would in all probability be the scene of the first great victory of the European proletariat. But thirteen years have sufficed to bog the German movement in the swamps of Parliamentarianism. Great Britain, whose Chartist movement was expected to provide the British proletariat with a tradition has furnished few examples of skill in the management of proletarian politics, but existing society in Great Britain has none the less been thoroughly undermined. The year before that in which Herr Duehring made his statement of conversion, the British Liberals had suffered a defeat which, in spite of an apparent recuperation in 1880,

of science, equally with that of philosophy, he scouts as absurd. To interpret the history of the time in terms of the spirit of the time, to discover the actual beneath the crust of the conventional, to analyse the content of the formula which the majority are always ready to take on trust, and to face the fact with a mind clear of preconceived notions is what Engels set out to do. It cannot be said that he altogether succeeded. No man can succeed in such a task. The prejudices and animosities created by incessant controversy warped his judgment in some respects and tended on more than one occasion to destroy his love of fair play. The spirit which is occasionally shown in his controversial writing is to be deplored, but it may be said, in extenuation, that all controversies of that time were disfigured in the same way. He pays the penalty for the fault.

Much of the work is valueless to day because of Engels' eagerness to score a point off his adversary rather than to state his own case. But where the philosopher lays the controversialist on one side for a brief period, and takes the trouble to elucidate his own ideas we discover what has been lost by these defects of temperament. He possesses in a marked degree the gift of clear analysis and of keen and subtle statement.

He socialist movement everywhere arrives some time or other at what may be called the Duehring stage of controversy. There are two very distinct impulses towards socialism. The individuals who are influenced by these impulses must sooner or later come into collision, and as a result of the impact the movement is for a time divided into hostile parties and a war of pamphleteering and oratory supervenes. This period has just ended in France. For the last few years the French movement has been divided upon the question of the philosophical foundation of the movement and the parties to the controversy may be divided into those who sought to justify the movement upon ethical grounds and those who have regarded it as a modern political phenomenon dependent alone upon economic conditions. The former of these parties based its claims to the suffrages of the French people upon the justice of the socialistic demands. It proclaimed socialism to be the logical result of the Revolution, the necessary conclusion from the teachings of the revolutionary philosophers. Justice was the word in which they summed up the claims of socialism, that and Equality, for which latter term as Engels points out, the French have a fondness which amounts almost to a mania. Hence one party of the French socialist movement chose as a platform those very "eternal truths" which Engels ridicules and which it is the sole purpose of the present work to attack.

To kill "eternal truths" is however by no means an easy

Revolution is an everyday occurrence with the industrial proletarian. He sees processes transformed in the twinkling of an eye. He wakes up one morning to find that the trade which he has learned laboriously has overnight become a drug on the market. He is used to seeing the machine whose energy has enchained him flung on the scrap heap and contemptuously disowned, in favor of a more competent successor whose motions he must learn to follow or be himself flung on the scrap heap also. This constant revolution in the industrial process enters into his blood. He becomes a revolutionist by force of habit. There is no need to preach the dialectic to him. It is continually preached. The transitoriness of phenomena is impressed upon him by the changes in industrial combinations, by the constant substitution of new modes of production for those to which he has been accustomed, substitutions which may make "an aristocrat of labor" of him to-day, and send him tramping to-morrow.

The industrial proletarian therefore knows practically what Engels has taught philosophically. So that when, in the course of his political peregrinations, he strays into the socialist movement and there finds those who profess a socialism based upon abstract conceptions and "eternal truths" his contempt is as outspoken as that of a Friedrich Engels who chances upon a certain Eugen Duehring spouting paraphrases of Rousseau by the socialistic wayside. Engels simply anticipated, by the way of books, the point of view reached by the industrial proletarian of to-day, by the way of experience, and by the American machine-made proletarian in particular. This is a matter of no mean importance.

For their popular support classes and governments rely upon formulae. When the cry of "Down with the Tsar" takes the place of the humbly spoken "Little Father" what becomes of the Tsardom? When the terms "Liberty" and "Equality" become the jest of the workshop, upon what basis can a modern democratic state depend? This criticism of "eternal truths" is destructive criticism, and destructive of much more than the "truths." It is more destructive than sedition itself. Sedition may be suppressed cheaply in these days of quick-firing guns and open streets. But society crumbles away almost insensibly beneath the mordant acid of contemptuous analysis. So to-day goaded on the one side by the gibes of the machine-made proletariat, and on the other, by the raillery of the philosophic jester, society staggers along like a wounded giant and is only too glad to creep into its cave and to forget its sorrows in drink.

As for 1875, "Many things have happened since then" as Beaconsfield used to say, but of all that has happened nothing could have given more cynical pleasure to the "Old Jew" than that lack of faith in its own shibboleths which has seized the

cocksure pompous society in which he disported himself. The rhetoric of a Gladstone based upon the "eternal truths" which constituted always the foundations of his political appeals would fail to affect the masses to-day with any other feeling than that of ridicule. We have already arrived at the "Twilight of the Gods" at least so far as "eternal truths" are concerned. They still find however an insecure roosting place in the pulpits of the protestant sects.

If blows have been showered upon the political "eternal truths," in the name of which the present epoch came into existence, social and ethical ideals have by no means escaped attack. Revolt has been the watchword of artist and theologian alike. The Pre-Raphaelite school, a not altogether unworthy child of the Chartist movement, raised the cry of artistic revolt against absolutism and the revolt spread in ever widening circles until it exhausted itself in the sickly egotism of the *art nouveau*. Even Engels with all his independence and glorification of change, as a philosophy, can find an opportunity to fling a sneer at Wagner and the "music of the future." The remnants of early Victorianism cling persistently to Engels. He cannot release himself altogether from the bonds of the bourgeois doctrine which he is so anxious to despise. He is in many respects the revolutionist of "48," a bourgeois politician, possessed at intervals by a proletarian ghost, such as he says himself ever haunts the bourgeois. The younger generation without any claims to revolutionism has gone further than he in the denunciation of authority and without the same self-consciousness. The scorn of Bernard Shaw for the mogul of the academies and for social ideals is greater than the scorn of Engels for "eternal truths." Says Mr. Shaw. "The great musician accepted by his unskilled listener is vilified by his fellow musicians. It was the musical culture of Europe that pronounced Wagner the inferior of Mendelsohn and Meyerbeer. The great artist finds his foes among the painters and not among the men in the street. It is the Royal Academy that places Mr. Marcus Stone above Mr. Burne Jones. It is not rational that it should be so but it is so for all that. The realist at last looses patience with ideals altogether and finds in them only something to blind us, something to numb us, something to murder self in us. Something whereby instead of resisting death we disarm it by committing suicide." Here is a note of modernity which Engels was hardly modern enough to appreciate and yet it was written before he died.

Nietzsche, Tolstoy and a host of minor writers have all had their fling at "eternal truths" and modern ideals. Thus, the battle has long since rolled away from the ground on which Engels fought. His arguments on the dialectic are common-places to-day which it would be a work of supererogation to ex-

plain to anyone except the persistent victim of Little Bethel. The world has come to accept them with the equanimity which it always shows to long disputed truths.

The sacred right of nationality for which men contended in Engels' youth, as a direct consequence of political "eternal truths" has been ruthlessly brushed aside. The philosopher talks of the shameful spoliation of the smaller by the larger nations, a moral view of commercial progress, which an age, grown more impatient of "eternal truths" than Engels himself simply ignores, and moves on without a qualm to the destruction of free governments in South Africa. Backward and unprogressive peoples jeer, it is true, and thereby show their political ineptitude, for even the American Republic, having freed the negro under the banner of "eternal truth" annexes the Philippines and raids Panama in defiance of it.

And so since the days of 1875 the world has come to accept the general correctness of Engels' point of view.

The enemy which Engels was most anxious to dislodge was "mechanical socialism," a naive invention of a perfect system, capable of withstanding the ravages of time, because founded upon eternal principles of truth and justice. That enemy has now obeyed the law of the dialectic and has passed away. Nobody builds such systems, nowadays. They have stopped their building, however, not in obedience to the commands of Friedrich Engels, but because the lapse of time and the change in conditions have revolutionised the revolutionist. With the annihilation of "eternal truths," system building ceased to be even an amusing pastime. The revolutionist has been revolutionised. He no longer fancies that he can make revolutions. He knows better. He is content to see that the road is kept clear so that revolutions may develop themselves. Your real revolutionist, for example, puts no obstacle in the path of the Trust, he is much too wise. He leaves that to the corrosion of time and the development of his pet dialectic. He sees the contradiction concealed in the system which apparently triumphs, and in the triumph of the system he sees also the triumph of the contradiction. He waits until that shadowy proletariat which haunts the system takes on itself flesh and blood and shakes the system with which it has grown up. But this waiting for the development of the inevitable is weary work to those who want to realise forthwith, so they, unable to confound the logic of Engels, attack the "abstractions" on which his theory is founded. They still oppose their "eternal truths" to the dialectic.

Thus, in England, where the strife between the two parties in the socialist movement has lately been waged with a somewhat amusing ferocity, Engels is charged with a wholesale borrowing from Hegel. In any other country than England this would

not be laid up against a writer, but the Englishman is so averse to philosophy that the association of one's name with that of a philosopher, and a German philosopher in particular, is tantamount to an accusation of keeping bad company. A glance at the pages of the *Anti-Duehring* should tend to dispose of so romantic a statement, which could in fact only have been made by those who know neither Hegel or Engels.

That Hegel furnished the original philosophic impetus to both Marx and Engels is true beyond question, but the impetus, once given, the course of the founders of modern socialism tended ever further from the opinions of the idealistic philosopher. In fact Engels says, somewhat self-consciously, (not to say boasts) that he and his followers were pioneers in applying the dialectic to materialism. Whatever accusation may be made against Engels, this much is certain that he was no Hegelian. In fact both in the *Anti-Duehring* and in "*Feuerbach*" he is at pains to show the relation of the socialist philosophy as conceived by himself and Marx to that of the great man for whom he always kept a somewhat exaggerated respect, but from whom he differed fundamentally. Engels' attack upon the philosophy of Duehring is based upon dislike of its idealism, the fundamental thesis upon which the work depends being entirely speculative. Duehring insisted that his philosophy was a realist philosophy and Engels' serious arguments, apart from the elaborate ridicule with which he covers his opponent and which is by no means a recommendation to the book, is directed to show that it is not a realist philosophy, but that it depends upon certain preconceived notions. Of these notions some are axiomatic, as Duehring claims, that is, they are propositions which are self-evident to Herr Duehring but which will not stand investigation. Others again are untrue and are preconceptions so far as they are out of harmony with established facts.

Much of Engels' work is out-of-date judged by recent biological and other discoveries, but the essential argument respecting the interdependence of all departments of knowledge, and the impossibility of making rigid classifications holds good to-day in a wider sense than when Engels wrote. Scientific truths which have been considered absolute, theories which have produced approximately correct results have all been discredited. The dogmas of science against which the dogmatic ecclesiastics have directed their scornful contempt have shared the same fate as the ecclesiastical dogmas. Nothing remains certain save the certainty of change. There are no ultimates. Even the atom is suspect and the claims of the elements to be elementary are rejected wholesale with something as closely resembling scorn as the scientist is ever able to attain. A scientific writer has recently said, "What is undeniable is that the Daltonian atom has within

Why Revivals No Longer Revive.

IN THIS country and in protestant Europe attempts have recently been made to awaken the old-time fervor of the religious revival. Perhaps there has never been attempted a religious movement upon a larger scale and with so thorough concert of forces. Last winter nearly every large city had its evangelistic campaign in which nearly all of the protestant denominations joined.

In spite, however, of the most thorough organization on the part of the religionists and every available device of the professional evangelist, automobile street performances, the appealing pathos of music, the tearful words of preachers, the personal testimonies of the faithful and the climacterical sensationalism of a midnight march of the religious, including men, women and children, through the red regions of the tenderloin districts; in spite of all the unction and hurrah enthusiasm that a traveling troop of evangelists, well groomed and well paid, could put forth, there has been manifest no mighty outpouring of the Holy Ghost, no awakening, no revival. Why? Some will reply that the people are becoming spiritually degenerate. As a matter of fact, the opposite is the real truth. It is because the people through the influence of economic development and scientific discovery have become ethically intelligent, and have caught glimpses of higher social laws, possibilities and destinies, that the crude conception of life and the gross interpretations of the teachings of Jesus can no longer awaken genuine and normal emotion. Religion, like everything else, cannot escape the process of development. Real religion, if it is anything, is life at its best. It is written of Him in whose name this revivalistic campaign is waged, that He said, "I came that ye might have life and that ye might have it more abundantly." Now life means unfoldment, continuous revelation through the process of evolution and revolution, growth and birth. That conception of life which was natural and moral in the yesterday of history may be unnatural and immoral to-day. Outgrown ideas are not living ideas that take hold upon the world to inspire and renew it.

There are two distinct reasons why this old-time revivalism must fail. In the first place it is individualistic. Its formula and habit were born at the historical period of intense individualism. As yet the controlling factor in social evolution is the economic evolution. Providing for the body is as yet in real life the chief concern of the race. Most time and most energy is so

“The New International.”

THE MEETING of the International Socialist Bureau at Brussels on Sunday and Monday last was scarcely so well attended as had been hoped; while the absence of Dr. Adler and any representative of either Spain, Italy or the United States, was certainly unfortunate at this juncture. It is obvious that the various nationalities have not yet taken the Bureau as seriously as it ought to be taken, and fail to understand that here in Brussels is the centre which may give the great and growing Socialist party in all nations an ever-increasing influence on the affairs of the world. The old International was merely an idea. There were a few generals without an army. To-day there is an important army of Socialists in every civilised country, and if they were properly organised as an international force and their delegates were sent fully instructed to the Bureau, as they ought to be, they would be far the greatest power on the side of peace and goodwill that is to be found in the world. Moreover, the interchange of information and the personal acquaintances made are also most important, and could avert many misunderstandings. We talk a great deal about internationalism and international action, but so far there has been very little of it put into action in such wise as to impress the hostile ruling classes in Europe.

There were, however, 13 nationalities represented by their delegates at this meeting of the Bureau, and the presence of Bebel and Kautsky for Germany, of Jaurès and Vaillant for France, would alone have sufficed to make the gathering notable. The first business taken was Vaillant's resolution in favor of all efforts being made by Socialists to establish and maintain peace. This gave rise to a very interesting discussion, and Jaurès in particular gave some details in relation to recent French policy which put the policy of the French Socialists in a very favourable light. Unfortunately, no definite plan of action was discussed or formulated. It was very difficult for delegates outside France and Germany to suggest any specific steps which might be taken by Socialists in those two countries before the outbreak of war in addition to what is already being done. When war should once break out, it was also felt that then also no general rule or policy could possibly be laid down. Bebel gave some remarkable figures as to the actual cost to Germany of the first mobilisation, apart from the expenses of war itself, which showed that even the most successful campaign

were delivered, the most important being by Jaurès, who throughout spoke on a very high level and aroused indescribable enthusiasm in the great audience by his strong appeal to the peoples to break asunder for ever the bonds of a degrading capitalism which held them in its grip while carrying on its nefarious proceedings in Morocco and elsewhere. Bebel did not appear. As he had been announced and advertised to speak, all our Brussels and the other delegates fully expected him to come; his absence occasioned great disappointment and regret.

Monday's meeting was chiefly taken up with detail work, and the delegates separated with the impression that if such gatherings were held more frequently and less time were devoted to elaborate arguments, a great step towards international organisation would be taken.—*From "Justice," London.*

soon startled by the announcement that none other than Claypool had confessed that he himself had placed the dynamite where it was discovered. And Claypool, it was further developed, was a nephew of Superintendent Starr, of the bridge trust. He made some flimsy excuse of trying to scare the corporation and force the re-employment of several scabs who were said to be have been discharged. He was bound over to a higher court on nominal bail, and it is doubtful whether he will be sentenced to the penitentiary. Had Claypool been a union man the whole organized labor movement of the country would have been denounced in double-leaded editorials, and the thieving Walshes would never tire of howling for "law and order." The matter has been seriously discussed by some of the labor officials of organizing a detective bureau of their own to hunt down the dastardly scoundrels who are constantly perpetrating crime while in the pay of plutocrats and casting the blame on organized labor.

The occurrence that has aroused the greatest interest in the minds of the working people next to the troubles of the coal miners and long-shoremens during the past few months was the imprisonment of Mayer, Haywood and Pettibone. From one end of the country to the other the labor class has become aroused as it never was before. Protest meetings have been held by the hundreds, resolutions by the bushels have been adopted, and funds have been and are being collected in every branch of industry. The most conservative organizations vie with the most radical in giving substantial evidence of uncompromising opposition to the villainous methods that have been adopted by the tyrannical mine-owners and their Cossacks and Black Hundred to railroad men to the scaffold because they dared to dedicate their lives to the uplifting of their fellow-workers. The readers of the REVIEW have undoubtedly kept themselves informed through the daily papers of the developments that have taken place from time to time in this Western drama, from the night that the men were kidnaped through the connivance of two governors owned body and soul by the mine-owners to the recent decision of Chief Justice Gabbert, of the Colorado Supreme Court, in which he declared that "the governor of the state has the power to suspend habeas corpus at his discretion and that the courts cannot review the action." Thus at one blow this eminent jurist has invaded the sanctuary of American liberty and seeks to drag us back into the Dark Ages to keep company with the brutality and inquisitorial methods of tyrants whose names stink in oblivion. It has been asked, Is Colorado in Russia? Judging from the autocratic manner in which the plutocrats and their politicians corrupt courts, override constitutions, laws and every semblance of decency, and the supine, cringing way in which the voters of that state swallow every insult and accept every blow, it begins to look as though Colorado is several degrees deeper in slavery and monarchy than the Russians. Even when Lincoln suspended habeas corpus as a war measure the thoughtful men of his time expressed grave doubts regarding the wisdom of enforcing such a drastic measure. But in Colorado there is no war to overthrow the state, and no necessity for government resorting to such extreme means to perpetuate itself. Gabbert promulgated his edict because he was morally certain that the people of Colorado did not possess sufficient moral stamina to drive him from office and drag him, as well as his masters, before the bar of justice and place them on trial for committing high treason. The plutocrats have become blind drunk with the power they possess, and, knowing all about the rottenness and corruption that exists in the political life of the Centennial State, no methods are too vile that will not be eagerly seized to destroy the last vestige of freedom and enthrone the usurping multimillionaires whose insatiable greed and thirst for power causes them to resort to every scheme to wreck the Republic. Either habeas corpus is

To be sure there is a great difference between these two works. One, called "Russian literature," is written by the well-known essayist and sociologist, Kropotkin. It is an enlargement of a number of addresses delivered by him in the year 1901 at the Lowell institute in Boston, and contains a short summary of Russian literature from the time of the primitive folk songs until today, with special consideration of the modern writers, under which he includes the whole literature of the 19th Century. During this time if we disregard the old folk tales there has arisen for the first time a national literature with its own style.

The work by Gorky is of a wholly different character. This is entitled simply "Political Discussions" and is occupied largely with the psychology of the Russian middle class (*Klein-burgertum*). Through some twenty pages he treats upon Russian literature and its relations to social conditions.

The manner, however, in which he does this makes it very significant. This hastily prepared writing brings more instruction and deeper insight into the essence of Russian literature than the industriously and carefully prepared and interesting work of Kropotkin. The latter supplies us with a mass of important details, and gives much information concerning the activities, peculiarities and biographies of many writers. What it lacks is a general view of the distinctive, peculiar essence of Russian literature.

There is a good reason for this. The writer lacks that cosmical view furnished by Marxism, which would enable him to distinguish the universal in the many writers to which he introduces us; he has no common ground from which to judge life and reflect it back. He fails to see that the inmost essence, the peculiar spirit of the literature of any epoch is but the living reflection of that class to whose views and conceptions, hopes and aspirations the author gives expression. Kropotkin has not clearly grasped this inner essence, this spirit, this *class character*.

Turn now to the work of Gorky.

There is an old saying that the poet knows nothing of politics; and for him to take part in them only brings him misfortune, and does evil to the political field as well. This may well be true — for bourgeois politics and bourgeois poets. It is certainly true that the idealistic aspirations of the poet would necessarily come in conflict with the bald selfishness, the cold cruelty, and the calculating hypocrisy that dominates the world of bourgeois politics. Bourgeois politics consists of disreputable generalities carefully hidden under the threadbare covering of "eternal truths."

The poet who enters this sort of politics is compelled to choose between becoming a confused ideologist and a hypocritical *phraseur* — either to betray himself or others. In either case he ceases to exist as a poet.

It is wholly different when the poet sings of proletarian class consciousness and proletarian politics. Here principles and practice are in harmony; deeds and ideals agree. Here there is no hypocrisy about the "general welfare" with which to cover up actual class interests; here there is the uplifting consciousness that the battle for class interests is identical with the battle for social progress, for the onward uplift of mankind. Nowhere today is this so completely true as in Russia, for nowhere else is it so plain that the proletariat represents the interests of all society. Nowhere else has the comprehension of the proletarian socialist position and the great ideas of Marxism by the intellectuals given such an impulse to their power and courage, and so filled them with new life as there. The writings of comrade Gorky give a striking example of this. They illustrate how taking part in proletarian politics, how becoming a socialist, so far from injuring a writer, raise him above his earlier self.

Gorky's writing, which we are discussing, was first published as an article in a Russian Socialist paper, which appeared in the heat of the battle, during that brief, quickly darkened, but never-to-be-forgotten dawn of freedom, which followed the great victory of the working-class last October. For a brief period the atmosphere was filled with the pride of battle and the joy of victory, as the air of a winter day is filled with tingling particles of frost.

Consequently it bears the traces of its origin. It is the work of an author at a time when he desired only to be a fighter, and felt only as a fighter. No attempt is made to explain *why* Russian literature is what it is; he does not attempt to explain what are its relations to social conditions, however clearly he may perceive these. He seeks only to judge its character and to express how this Russian literature appears to him through his new eyes; how it seems to him from the point of view of a new heart and a new brain — from the new class standpoint: the attitude and point of view of the revolutionary proletariat. This is what Gorky's writing means and only this. This is the significant, the new, the peculiar and the important thing, that for the first time an important Russian author looks upon the whole Russian literature with new eyes. For the first time he bravely, firmly, relentlessly expresses what his eyes see. For the first time, through him, a new class looks upon this old, venerated, sacred structure of Russian literature, without awe, without timidity, without veneration. For the first time this new class tosses aside the old critical estimates of this material and creates for itself new standards. For the first time the proletariat judges this national literature, as it judges all else on earth — according to the degree of *its* needs, *its* hopes, *its* loves and *its* hates.

The essence, the spirit of a literature is found in its com-

So far as the facts of "The Jungle" is concerned I want to bear testimony here that terrible as is the arraignment, comrade Sinclair has still fallen far short of the truth. The time which he spent in study was too short to learn the whole truth — indeed it would have taken a life-time. But a large portion of his facts are notorious. Many of them were published by me six years ago. Since the appearance of "The Jungle" I have taken the trouble to look into those statements made by comrade Sinclair with which I was not familiar, and I have verified, by men who know whereof they speak all those which have been challenged, and have learned much more that cannot be told because of the suffering which it would entail upon the workers who are forced to do the sort of work which is denied as existing.

I make this statement after careful consideration of the facts as I know them, and "The Jungle," and its critics, that the person who claims that Sinclair has exaggerated speaks either from mendacity or ignorance — is either a liar or a fool.

The Chicago Evening Post sent out a reporter to get opinions on its truthfulness and published several columns of interviews on the subject. Strange as it may seem (?) the priests, preachers, packers and philanthropists of the Stock Yards district all agreed that the book was "overdrawn." On the other hand conversation directly and indirectly with the only people who know what they are talking about — the workers in the Yards — has failed to find a man who does not agree that it is a truthful picture.

To take some of the incidents that have been specifically challenged. I knew the family whose child was drowned in the gutter; I have helped to treat dozens of cases of infection and blood-poisoning of Yard's workers; I have known men and their families who have fallen into the rendering vats; I have talked with employes who had helped in the dodging of inspection and the marketing of rotten meat; as agent of the Stock Yards District of the Bureau of Charities, and a volunteer inspector of the Chicago Health Department I have seen things in the lives of the workers in Packingtown more terrible than any depicted in "The Jungle." Best of all, as a Socialist, I have seen the growth of Socialism in that locality until today it contains the highest percentage of socialist voters of any large industrial center in the world. I give this personal testimony because of the attacks which have been made upon "The Jungle" by ignorant or corrupt book reviewers and by others who are interested in the maintenance of conditions as they are in Packingtown.

A. M. SIMONS.

mento of Revisionism, is what Bernstein has to say on the tendencies of the development of modern capitalism, although he criticises both the philosophic and economic theories of Marx. The discussion of these tendencies forms the bulk of Revisionist literature. And in the forefront of this discussion is the question: Does capital concentrate and the middle-class disappear, and as rapidly, as Marx predicted?

In his now famous book Bernstein attempted to prove: 1st, that capital does not concentrate in the manner, and certainly not with the rapidity that Marx predicted; and 2nd, that the middle-class does not disappear. To substantiate his assertions he cites some statistics to show that while there certainly is a tendency towards concentration, and even rapid concentration, in some industries, this tendency is not universal, and moreover, in the very industries in which this tendency does exist it is in a measure neutralized by the birth of new enterprises in the place and stead of those which disappear owing to the process of concentration. The conclusion to which he arrives, therefore, is that, while concentration of capital undoubtedly takes place, it does not take place in all the capitalist industries, and is, on the whole, extremely slow. He also cites another series of statistical data apparently showing that the tendencies in the distribution of incomes in modern society is not, as is assumed by Marxists, towards a wiping out of moderate incomes, and leaving only a small minority with large revenues and the bulk of society with only workingmen's wages. But, on the contrary, the tendency is towards an *increase* of the *number* of persons whose income is derived from the possession of property. From this he argues that the middle-class does not disappear, but on the contrary is growing.

The likelihood of the growth of the middle-class in numbers while capital was undergoing a steady, though slow, process of concentration, would seem of such doubtful nature as to raise a suspicion as to character of the statistics. Bernstein saw this, and he, therefore, hastens to allay our suspicions by the following observation: The corporation — says he — tends to neutralize to a large extent the tendency towards centralization of wealth through the centralization of undertakings. The corporation permits of a widespread splitting up of already concentrated capital, and makes superfluous the acquisition of capitals by individual magnates for the purposes of the concentration of industrial undertakings. Wherefore, he opines, the opinion, "prevailing among socialists," that the concentration of wealth runs parallel to the concentration of industrial undertakings is erroneous.

In the book which Kautsky has written in reply to Bernstein, "Bernstein and the Social Democratic Program," he shows

that Bernstein's statistics are unreliable and incomplete, and that the conclusions he draws from them are unjustified. We shall not enter here upon a detailed discussion of these statistics, as this would be beyond the scope of the present work. Besides, we fully agree with one Marx critic, Oppenheimer, who, evidently disgusted with the poor showing Bernstein made with his statistics, declares that those who attempt to refute Marx by statistics are on the wrong track. For, says he, you can only beat Marx by his own method, and the Marxian method is not at all statistical. Marx never relies on statistics to prove his assertions. He uses statistics only for the purposes of illustration. His proofs he gets from well-known facts which may be recorded in the statistical tomes but do not need any statistics to establish them. We will say here only this: Since the disastrous attempt of Bernstein to use statistics against the Marxian position, this weapon has been almost entirely discarded by Revisionists. On the other hand it must be admitted that Marxists also resort to statistics now with less confidence than formerly. It seems that since the publication of their books in which the same statistics are used by Bernstein on the one hand and Kautsky on the other, and such different conclusions arrived at by each, people have become distrustful of statistics. Oppenheimer voices this general distrust when he says: "Statistics are an extremely pliable mass, as the literary controversy between Bernstein and Kautsky has shown. With a little dialectical dexterity you can prove almost anything statistically."

We disagree with the learned Marx-critic that you can prove anything and everything by statistics. But we do believe that you can prove nothing by statistics unless you handle them intelligently. Of themselves statistics do not prove anything. No more than facts of themselves prove anything. If it were so there could hardly be two opinions on most points which have been in controversy ever since scientific research began. It requires intellect to read the facts. It requires intelligence to read statistics. Furthermore, it requires great intelligence to gather statistics, and in this respect statistics, which are mere records of facts, are a poorer basis for scientific generalizations than facts of observation. Unfortunately our statistics are not gathered by the people who are to use them, and as they are necessarily not full and complete, they must be used with great care and discrimination. Of course wrong or unintelligent handling of statistics will not make them "prove" anything that they really do not prove, as Oppenheimer seems to think, but it will render them worthless.

Kautsky has proven that Bernstein's statistics do not prove his assertions. The reason for it is that Bernstein handles his statistics unintelligently. But even Kautsky's intelligent handling

could not make them yield any great results because of the incompleteness of our statistics and of the lack of intelligence in their gathering. Hence the general dissatisfaction on both sides with statistics. We will, therefore, follow here the Marxian method of making only such facts the basis of our argument as require no statistical tables to prove them, but merely to illustrate.

Before proceeding, however, to discuss these facts we want to call attention to some significant circumstances in connection with the Revisionist movement and its literature. First in point of time and importance is the tone of early Revisionist Marx-criticism. We have already called attention to the nihilistic character of this literature. Now we desire to add that this nihilism was a gradual growth and was forced on the revisionists by their own inability to solve the problems which confronted them. At its inception Revisionism was merely doubtful. Doubt is the *leit-motif* of Bernstein's first literary attempts at revision. In the second place is to be considered the inability of the old-school Marxist to stem the flood of Revisionism, notwithstanding their great efforts. While the flood of Revisionism is now at a standstill, if not subsiding, this is not due to the efforts of the Marxian leaders on the theoretical field, but to its practical barrenness. And yet, there was enough in what was written by Marxists to show the utter untenableness of the revisionists' position. Kautsky's book was a crushing blow to Bernstein's attempts at theorizing. Yet it passed almost without any appreciable results: the question of Revisionism was not settled, although it should have been if it were a question of soundness of argument. Thirdly, we must notice the fact which we have already mentioned as the reason for the failure of the Revisionist movement: the fact that notwithstanding its great literary influence the Revisionist movement was absolutely barren of practical results as far as the socialist movement was concerned.

All of these facts and circumstances is proof positive that there must have been something in the development of modern economic life which caused the appearance of the revisionist movement as an intellectual endeavor to take cognizance of and explain this development. It is clear that this development, whatever it may be was not, or at least not fully, reflected in our statistics, which accounts for the fact that neither side could prove its case conclusively by the aid of statistics, and the consequent distrust of all statistics. What was that something in the development of modern economic life, and how does it affect the Marxian theory?

The trouble with Bernstein and the rest of the Revisionist writers is that they do not go below the surface of things, and therefore do not know what "struck them," to use an inelegant

the development of corporations. The fact, however, that Bernstein and the rest of the Revisionists failed to present it properly makes the phenomenon none the less real. The Marxian analysis of the capitalist system and his deductions as to the laws of its development proceed upon the assumption of the absolute reign of the principle of competition. It was on the basis of that assumption that he declared that during the progress of capitalistic development "one capitalist kills off ten," thereby centralizing all wealth in the hands of a steadily diminishing number of persons, eliminating the middle classes and leaving society divided into two classes only: capitalists and workingmen. But what if competition should be abolished or checked? What if the capitalists, large and small, should decide not to compete any more with each other, or restrict the area and intensity of such competition, and divide profits amicably instead of fighting with each other over their division, so as to avoid the necessity of killing each other off? Evidently the result would be the arrest of the processes described by Marx in the event of the entire abolition of competition, and a retarding of those processes in the event of its mere checking. This is just what must happen owing to the development of corporations. The supplanting of individual enterprise by that of corporate is merely an attempt to avoid the results of competition, if not altogether abolish it. The effectual abolition of competition by the so-called Trusts, which are merely the logical result of the ordinary corporation-enterprise, is notorious and, practically, undisputed. But it is not only the Trust that interferes with competition. The primary, nay, the only purpose of a legitimate corporation is to blunt the edge of competition. It is designed either to nullify or suspend the baneful effects of past competition or to prevent or diminish its ravages in the future. There can be only two legitimate reasons for organizing corporations. Either to enable those whose capital is insufficient to keep abreast of the latest requirements of production to remain in the field from which they are individually forced out by the march of events by combining their several insufficient individual capitals into one sufficient to meet the new requirements; or to enable those whose capital is sufficient to undertake independently to split up their large capitals into many small ones, each to invest in many undertakings and each undertaking to consist of many investments, instead of each taking up one of the undertakings on his own hook. In the first case it is an effort to beat fate by those vanquished in competition. It is an effort by those whom competition has forced out of the economic arena to stay in, by *representation* at least. In the second case it is an effort to limit the effects of competition in the future by dividing up and limiting its risks and liabilities (it should be remembered

Materialistic Interpretation of History.

I HAVE been absent from home and have only now on my return received the March number of the REVIEW, and read your reply to my criticism of the "materialistic interpretation of history" contained in my little book, "Garrison, the Non-Resistant." In your article you invite a reply, and while I doubt the wisdom of continuing such a controversy, I will add a few lines of comment.

The position which I took in my "Garrison" was that man's ideals and will played a large part in human history in general, and in the history of the abolition of slavery in particular, and that no merely material interpretation of history would suffice to explain all the facts. I insisted that the ideal must be mixed with the material to account for the sequence of human events. To this you reply that the socialist never contended that the food desire was the only one influencing man but that he always maintained that "it was the way in which man satisfied *all* his desires that determined his social institutions."

This admission seems to me to open the door to all idealism, and we really are in agreement. "*All*" a man's desires include his desires to establish the kingdom of heaven on earth, to put an end to poverty and suffering, to send messages round the earth by electricity and to fly in the air and navigate under the sea. This is all that I have ever claimed, and while you call it the "materialistic interpretation" I should call it the "idealistic interpretation" of history. Our only difference is one of definition.

But when you come to define the idealism which you admit, you limit its scope most unnecessarily. You say, quoting Mrs. Simons, that the "systems of justice, morality, etc., which have arisen in previous social stages undoubtedly have a part in determining social institutions to-day. But how? They constitute the material upon which present economic environment must act, and they may so resist that environment as to greatly alter it. But when we analyze that back to its ultimate, we find that it is not a conflict between ideas and environment, but a conflict between a past and present environment."

This is a very pretty theory, but I produced facts in my former argument which it is unable to account for, and which you overlooked in your reply. I refer to the effect upon industry of the action of idealist vegetarians in changing their diet. When I wrote I thought that any perceptible effect of

on the policy of the Government. Parliamentary government as understood in England and in France does not exist in Germany, and this realized will enable people to see the grave dangers of a State which has for its head a ruler having the characteristics of the present sovereign. It will also be seen how difficult it is for the Socialists to effect any change, though they are strong in the Reichstag, and that the fear of universal suffrage being tampered with is not idle. The Socialists threaten that if this be done then they will proclaim a general strike, but I very much fear that it would not be successful. The military spirit is very strong in Germany, and I think that any attempt at an insurrection would be suppressed with great severity, and would be followed by a period of dismal reaction.

JACQUES BONHOMME.

The New Socialist School.

THE trustees of the Rand fund for the establishment of a school to teach social science from the standpoint of International Socialism have empowered the American Socialist society, an incorporated body formed in 1901, to found and maintain such a school.

The society has accepted the charge, and has been for some time actively engaged in the preliminary work of organization. It has leased for a term of years the large residence building at 112 East Nineteenth street, and will take possession on July 1. The rooms on the parlor floor will be fitted up for a library, reading room, archive, office and book-stand, and the rooms on the second floor for class rooms.

The leading Socialist publications of the world will be kept on file. A collection of the most authoritative works on Socialism and Social Problems will be made, \$1,000 having been apportioned for the beginning of the library. An archive of old and rare manuscripts, pamphlets and books relating to Socialism and labor will also be collected. Comrades will be asked to contribute by loan or gift to this collection, which will be carefully guarded. Already several rare works have been promised.

It is expected to have the library and reading room ready for general use by July 15. The classes will begin on Monday, October 1. The instruction committee has prepared a tentative plan of studycourses, and though much remains to be done before definite announcement can be made, the following courses can be confidently promised at this time:

Systematic courses, with the use of text-books, personal assistance of instructors, examinations and seminars on

1. Elementary Socialism.
2. Economics of Socialism.
3. History of Socialism.
4. Nature and Functions of the State.
5. Composition and Rhetoric.

Lecture-Conference Courses, with opportunity for questioning instructors, on

1. Principles of Sociology.
2. Ethics.
3. Social Theories.
4. Social History.

Former lectures on a great variety of subjects, such as Methods and Tactics of the Socialist Movement; Socialism and Art,

Henrik Ibsen.

WITH the death of Henrik Ibsen modern life lost its most comprehensive and penetrating observer. Others may have seen piece meal more thoroughly; Maeterlinck the metaphysical; Whitman the unformed natural; Flaubert and Maupassant the passions; Tolstoi, Zola, and Gorky the grossly natural; Anunnzio the sensuous; Soti, natural beauty in a thousand fanciful aspects; Turgenieff and Bjornson simple sentiments and great patriotism.

But since Goethe no one has touched feelings and ideas of such wide range. From his poetry with the lyrical little songs and the impassioned lines of Brand and Peer Gyut to the most everyday talk in his later problem plays he is equally strong.

From the panoplied waning patriotism of the Middle Ages, in *The Pretenders* and *The Warriors* in Helgoland to modern smug bourgeois concern for the community in the *Pillars of Society* and the *League of Youth* the personnel and setting are equally well drawn. He sees the apple tree "dripping with blossoms" beloved by a busy bee and the mysterious awful ocean as he also sees stuffy old sofas, "rotten old tubs" of ships and bankrupt banks.

He makes good art the impossible idealism of Brand raving like a maniac against all that *Is*, but no less so Peer Gyut responsive to all that the senses are offered like a mote dancing in the sunbeams.

The morbid is as real as the healthy, the conventional as the unconventional whatever is, may or may not be right, but it *is*. Men and women and children living in houses, huts, villas, climbing mountains, carrying on war, encircling the globe. Little idiosyncracies, great motives, customs, heredity, laughing, quarreling, dancing, dying.

His plots are invariably slices out of the whole piece — an age, a community, a family, a personality — nothing scattered or confused. He is subtle enough to be stimulating. To what school of social thought he belongs one cannot say. He flings the individual at society and society at the individual with such shuttlecock speed that he cannot be classified. His development was a natural one and in touch with the times. Catalina showed the influence of the Revolutions of 1848. And for many years all that followed was historical. Then came the social plays as the world was beginning to feel that evils were not so much political

machinery. It depends upon the Socialist press of the country as to whether they can be sufficiently aroused to take any decisive step at this time.

It is at least worth the effort. Let those Socialists who are members of trade-unions exert all the powers at their disposal to arouse indignation and resentment against the culmination of the Idaho conspiracy. As the trial progresses point out what such murderous victimization of working class leaders must result in, and of what tremendous importance it is that such methods be not permitted to be carried out without the exhaustion of every resource at the command of the working class.

Did it once become evident that these men could be sacrificed only at the price of a complete paralysis of the industrial life of America, even though that paralysis be but for a single day, the rulers of industry would pause before carrying out their purpose.

Nor would it require the co-operation of all the workers to accomplish this end. So interdependent is modern industry that the stoppage of any large percentage of the laborers would throw the whole machine out of gear. The agitation which would result from such an exhibition of class solidarity and working-class power would in itself be a mighty help towards preparing for the time of general emancipation.

The effort is worth while. *Let us prepare for it.*

* * *

With this issue the REVIEW closes its sixth volume. During that time it has published more original educational matter by leading socialist scholars, both American and foreign; more translations of standard articles from foreign books and periodicals; more matter bearing upon the international movement by persons active in that movement; more discussions of the fundamentals of socialist philosophy, and more reviews of works of interest to socialists,—more of each and all these things than, not simply any one socialist paper, but then all other socialist papers published in this country combined. If you think that such work as this ought to be continued try and secure at least one more subscriber for the coming year.

The July number will contain a continuation of the valuable articles on Marxism by Comrade Boudin, treating of the subject of concentration of wealth and the disappearance of the middle class. Mrs. May Wood Simons will have an article in the same number treating of the peculiar conditions prevailing in the London department stores, known as "living in." This is of special interest at this time as the Labor members in the House of Commons have announced their intention of investigating this condition.

* * *

Contrary to the popular impression the funds for the defense of the Western Federation officials has not yet reached a sum adequate to meet the pressing needs of the cause. Up to the present time the total funds available do not amount to much, if any more, than \$50,000.00, a sum

almost ridiculous in comparison with the amounts at the disposal of the state,—or rather of the Mine Owners' Association. Do not let this matter lag for lack of interest. *Our comrades' lives are depending upon it.*

* * *

The following extracts from a letter received recently from Comrade W. D. Haywood contain so much of the spirit of the man that we feel that its publication is permissible. The portions omitted were purely personal in character:

Ada County Jail, Boise, Idaho, April 25th, 1906.

A. M. SIMONS,

Chicago, Ills.

Dear Comrade:—It is good to get such letters as yours, to know we have the confidence and support of sterling men and women. It is good to know that at last the working class are aroused. We have heard from every prominent worker in the movement. Better still, we have heard the rumbling remonstrance of the working class itself. * * *

As you have learned, we are now in Boise, the Ada County Jail. Sheriff Mosely has done much to make us comfortable. We have been here a little over a month. It seems a lifetime since we left home.

Expected to have a visit with you in June, during the I. W. W. convention. But will probably be going through process of trial about that time. The prosecution cannot delay much longer. We have been ready for a hearing from the time we were *extradited*. But evidence seems to be a necessary article now, so our cases have been postponed to give Gov. Gooding time to *make a case*.

Moyer and Pettibone join in kindest regards to you. * * *

I very much regret the enemy has found means to prevent Gorky's mission from becoming the success it should have been. Capitalism, like the class struggle, is worldwide.

Yours fraternally,

WILLIAM D. HAYWOOD.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

The recent congress of the Socialists of Saxony shows that the party membership has doubled during the last five years, having increased from 25,000 to 54,000. The convention occupied itself largely with the formation of an organization for the young. This organization can be only indirectly Socialist, as otherwise it would conflict with the laws of Saxony.

The Polish Socialist party in Germany has at last united with the German Social Democracy. This is something that has been sought for years, but has always seemed impossible of accomplishment, owing to the nationalistic aspirations of the Polish Socialists. The resolution fixing the terms of union reads as follows:

"The Polish Social Democracy of Germany shall maintain an independent organization, for the purpose of agitation among the Polish population of Germany. The Polish organization is a fraction of the general German party. It recognizes the party platform and the party organization, and the German party congress as the highest authority. The writings which may be published in Polish shall be subject to the control of the Polish party officials and the convention of the Polish organizations. The 'Gazeta Robotnicza' is the official organ of the Polish comrades in the German Empire. It shall be controlled by a press committee, to which the German Social Democratic governing committee shall send one member."

Just to break the monotony of socialist growth the municipal election in the city of Darmstadt showed a decrease from 14,144 votes to 12,000. As a little off-set to this comes the report that since the adoption of the new and more centralized form of party organization the party membership has been making extremely rapid strides. In the one electoral district of Dortmund the party strength has risen from 2,000 to more than twice that number during the last year.

TASMANIA.

From "The Worker" of New South Wales we take the following paragraphs concerning the trend of events in Australia:

"Apart from the actual business transacted, the recent annual conference of the Amalgamated Miners' Association of Victoria and Tasmania, held at Stawell, was a very important one, for the delegates individually and collectively foreshadowed most unmistakably the imperative necessity of the organization extending its scope to the sphere of political action. The feeling that something definite should be done in this connection has been manifested for years, but never was it more pronounced than at Stawell, when fully 50 out of the 58 delegates present were solid for

railroads and is proceeding rapidly to absorb other industries. The government has absolutely declared that it does not oppose trusts and combinations, but on the contrary encourages their formation. All of which would seem to show once more that Japanese capitalists are able to give their fellow exploiters of the West lessons in management.

The last number of the Japanese Socialist magazine gives a table of contents of its last two issues from which we learn they contain, among other things, the "Communist Manifesto," Liebknecht's "Life of Marx," Kautsky's "Life of Engels" and a history of the International Socialist Congress.

The following clipping from *The Hikan* (The Light) may (and may not) give an idea of some phases of the Japanese Socialist movement:

"There are three schools, so to speak, of Japanese Socialism. The first is Nippon-Shakwi-To, Japanese Socialist Party, to which we belong. The second is a school of Christian Socialism. Their organ is *Shinkigen*, the New Era. But they declare that they are not the same thing such as English Christian Socialism which seems to be no more than charity institutions. They are also Social-Democrats. Only they strive to develop the spiritual side of Socialism. Mr. Abe, Mr. Kinoshita, Mr. Ishikawa and others belong to this. The third is Kokka-Shakwai-To, State-Socialist Party. Mr. Yamaji, a well-known journalist and historian, is its leader. He says that his State-Socialism is not the same thing such as German Socialism in Chair which is only social reforms without any definite aim. He is also a Scientific-Socialist. Only he applies Marx's ways of thinking to Japanese history. And he finds out that Marx's 'dualistic' view of present society (Proletariat and Bourgeois) is erroneous. So he established a new political 'trialism' (State, Bourgeois and Proletariat). This is the doctrine of State-Socialism. These schools may seem very singular to the eyes for foreigners. But this is a stage of development of Japanese Socialism."

FRANCE.

The election in France has most agreeably disappointed the Socialists. As was pointed out in these columns some time ago, the difficulties, both internal and external, under which the French comrades were laboring, were so great that few dared expect an increase in the vote or parliamentary strength.

The popular vote, so far as tabulated by the Socialist press, is given as follows: Conservative Liberals, 1,330,000; Radicals and Socialistic Radicals, 3,100,000; Nationalists, 380,000; Progressiveists, 1,170,000; Republicans, 850,000; Socialists, 960,000; Independent Socialists, 160,000.

The "Independent" Socialists are men like Millerand, Gerault, Richard, etc., who refuse to submit to party regulations. On the whole the vote was on very much clearer lines than ever before, and while the actual Socialist strength is something like 900,000, if the vote is to be compared with previous elections it would be much fairer to use the number 1,120,000, since it is certain that those who cast these votes were as much Socialists as those who cast the 880,000 of the previous election of 1900.

The first election, according to *Le Temps*, resulted in the election of the following deputies:

Conservatives ...	76
Nationals ...	29
Progressiveists ...	59

Total ... 164
of what might be called the conservative deputies.

AUSTRIA.

The municipal elections in Vienna add their story of the steady increase of socialist vote. In the fourth electoral class, that of the working class, the socialists elected seven out of twenty-one councilmen. They had only three at the previous election. The *Wiener Deutsches Tageblatt*, a non-socialist paper, admits that this was done in the face of the "most unscrupulous use of all means, honest and dishonest." The only effective opposition was from the so-called Christian Socialists, who are used as catspaws to capture working class votes. This party had previously possessed eighteen of the twenty-one seats. They lost four of these and their total vote was only 110,000 to 96,000 for the socialists.

when Mitchell, Lewis, Wilson and others could go into the anthracite region and deliver a terrific blow at the divine right theory by preaching socialism if they had the courage. Personally, I do not believe that they will utilize this golden opportunity to strike a blow that would stun the operators. It seems to be the fate of the great majority of union officials to fall down hard just when the time comes to take a long stride forward. I have seen it happen again and again, and it is deplorable to say the least.

In the bituminous coal fields it looks like a long and bitter strike. The operators in various parts of the competitive district are attempting to open the mines, and, as pointed out a month ago, are dragging out all their paraphernalia of war. The capitalists couldn't pay the 1903 scale — they are too poor. But hundreds of thugs are hired as guards at \$3 to \$3.50 a day and found. Then transportation and food is provided for strike-breakers; newspapers are salved with advertisements and employment agencies with fees; then there are retinues of hangers-on of various degrees who act as clerks, guides, spies, etc., not forgetting lawyers' fees and court costs in eviction cases, injunction proceedings and prosecutions of honest workmen against whom charges can be made. Neither are the bosses above handing out bribes to grafters in political and industrial positions of power. Still only a few weeks ago a gentleman in authority on the operators' side said to me, in the presence of a witness, that the bosses could and probably would make a settlement on the basis of the 1903 scale, provided that the miners would in turn concede the same conditions in and about the mines that exist in the Pittsburg district. He intimated that Robbins and his following who signed the 1903 scale were not losing anything for the reason that they raised rents and prices in their truck stores, and that while the pay envelopes of the men looked a little larger all the money was paid back to the operators again for increased cost of necessities. My informant admitted that it was a cold-blooded business, but that the operators were not in the game for amusement or their health. However, the operators must have changed their minds in spite of the alleged satisfactory conditions in the Pittsburg district, for they suddenly announced after a secret conference that they intended to fight. The probability is that they have decided to "throw off the yoke of union domination," and use the same tactics that have proven so successful in West Virginia, where the miners are little better than slaves, while the plutocrats and politicians of the Davis, Scott and Elkins crowd are touted far and near as great statesmen and workingmen's friends.

Meanwhile the A. F. of L. officials have not made the slightest move toward lending assistance to the miners in a financial way. Probably Gompers is too busy in Washington trying to figure out a political victory to pay attention to a little thing like a miners' strike. The latest reports are that the anti-injunction, eight-hour and employers' liability bills are to be shelved again. They are usually railroaded through one branch of Congress and forgotten in the other. But this fall we are going to "question candidates" some more and "reward our friends and punish our enemies." Perhaps "Friend" F. L. Robbins will be one of the lucky gentlemen to be "rewarded." He is reported as having aspirations to sit in the United States Senate and grind out labor laws. August Belmont, another shining light of the Civic Federation, is also said to be looking for political honors, and, of course, he, too, ought to come in for endorsement. There is no doubt but that the union people throughout the country are beginning to consider political action seriously. But when they start moving in earnest the fossilized scheme of Gompers won't receive much support. The workers will look to the Socialist party for results, and the time has arrived for Socialists everywhere to push the propaganda untiringly and systematically. Every member, especially if he belongs to a union, ought to load up with literature and place it where

it will do the most good. Purchase books and pamphlets, gather subscriptions for the party press and march forth and conquer the heathen. A little sacrifice at present will work wonders.

In this connection it might be added that the arrest of Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone has done as much, if not more, to arouse the country than any occurrence since the Civil War. Labor organizations all over the land continue to hold protest meetings and adopt resolutions condemning the Western outrage. In every gathering held the fact is pointed out that the day has arrived when the workers must assert their power politically or soon it may be too late when the ballot will be effective in righting wrongs. It is improbable that the Western Federation men will be railroaded to the gallows, as was undoubtedly the original intention. The plutocratic conspirators never dreamed that they would raise the storm of indignation that has swept over the nation, and they are positively betraying fear. But it is not well to relax vigilance at this critical juncture. Watch the papers carefully and don't hesitate to speak out plainly and frequently. Let the grand dukes and their "black hundred" know that the working class will stand for no more Haymarkets.

THE CURSE OF RACE PREJUDICE, by James F. Morton, Jr. *Published by the Author, at 244 W. 143d St., New York. Paper, 78 pp.; 25 cents.*

In the words of the introduction, this is an effort "to examine the essential characteristics of the human frailty known as race prejudice, and to trace it at least roughly to its origin; to indicate its influence in the decay of nations; to exhibit its fruits, as betraying the character of the tree whence they spring; to appeal to common sense against the bogey-worship which manifests itself in puerile fears and acts of worse than childish folly; to face squarely all the attempts to defend or palliate this great evil, and to meet every ostensible argument in behalf of race prejudice by an overwhelming refutation; and to establish the fundamental conditions of human progress, and to point out their irreconcilability with an indulgence in so demoralizing a superstition." So far as the arguments and the logic are concerned the author certainly has all the best of the affair. When he comes to causes and remedies, however, he is not so fortunate. He lacks the grasp of evolutionary thought and its relation to industrial life that would have given him the key to his subject, and he seems to trust entirely to the growth of a sentimental idealism to abolish race prejudice.

FROM STAR DUST TO SOCIALISM, by Rev. A. M. Stirton. *Appeal to Reason. Paper; 10 cents.*

One of those broad-sweeping general summaries of cosmical and social evolution, of which the Socialist writings already has so many, but which will always be needed so long as the great majority of the population act on the hypothesis that "things always were this way and always will be." Blatchford's "Reply to the Pope's Encyclical" is bound in the same volume.

THE FALLACIES OF SOCIALISM, by Rev. Chas. W. Tinsley, with a reply by Rev. J. H. Hollingsworth, and a final answer by the first writer. *The Terre Haute Tribune. Paper, 28 pp.; sent for stamp to pay postage.*

The criticism of Socialism is based so closely on R. T. Ely's "Socialism and Social Reform" as to suggest direct copying, and brings up the ordinary and frequently answered objections, which are well covered in Comrade Hollingsworth's reply.

LES PLAIES DU CAUCASE, by E. Akouni; with preface by Francis de Pressense, and introduction by Pierre Quillard. *Federation Rev. Armenienne, Geneva. Paper, 360 pp.*

Few portions of the Russian domain have suffered more than the Caucasus, and this work, published by the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, can probably be taken as an authentic statement of facts. We learn here how the schools have been destroyed, religious liberty abolished, books confiscated, periodicals suppressed and the defenders of liberty most brutally punished. There is also considerable discussion of the various wings of the revolutionary movements in this quarter and their methods of work.

THE CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH. THE TRUST SITUATION. THE PUBLIC HIGHWAYS, by Henry Laurens. *Published by the author, at 27 Thames St., New York. Paper, 32 pp.; 10 cents each.*

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

THE REBEL AT LARGE.

We have just concluded an arrangement by which we become the publishers of this remarkable book of socialist stories by MAY BEALS. Some of the stories have appeared in various socialist papers, and one edition in pamphlet form was printed, put on the market, and quickly sold out.

Our new edition, now printing and ready for delivery early in July, will be in cloth binding, uniform in size with the Standard Socialist Series and the Library of Science for the Workers, so that the book will fit well into several thousand socialist libraries that have been started.

It will fit well in more than the literal sense. May Beals has written stories that tell the story of socialism in a way that will reach many who have not yet been reached. She is a keen observer and a sympathetic interpreter of those who can not speak for themselves. She throws a flash-light on the dark places of our crumbling civilization, and makes us feel the hidden suffering of the millions of helpless ones who suffer as patiently as may be because they know not what else to do.

A gloomy book? It would be this indeed, but for one thing, and that is the glorious hope of the coming revolution, which will right the wrongs that have no other remedy.

Read it, lend it, sell it, give it! There is a charm about the stories that is hard to resist, and there is a relentless logic about them that makes rebels. Send your orders in now and the book will be sent next month. Cloth, 50 cents postpaid; usual discounts to stockholders.

SPECIAL PRICE ON "THE ANCIENT LOWLY."

We have bought from the author's heirs all the remaining copies of "The Ancient Lowly," by C. Osborne Ward. This work is in two large volumes, selling for \$2.00 each. Our stock of the second volume is now exhausted. We have the plates, and in the fall we shall print a new and uniform edition of both volumes. Meanwhile we desire to close out the remaining copies of the first volume. This is a work complete in itself. At the time it was written, no second volume was contemplated, and the first volume contains an immense amount of historical material of the highest value to socialists.

It is a book of 573 large octavo pages, with a number of full-page engravings, and it is well worth the regular price of two dollars a copy.

But we wish to get these copies out of the way quickly to make room for a new edition, and we need to turn them into cash as quickly as possible. We therefore offer them while they last to any reader of

the REVIEW at one dollar prepaid, and to stockholders at seventy cents postpaid or fifty cents by express at purchaser's expense.

LOOKING FORWARD.

This new work by Philip Rappaport is a treatise on the status of woman, and the origin and growth of the family and the state. It applies the theory of historical materialism in a popular and readable fashion, and will appeal as forcibly to non-socialists as to socialists.

This will be the eighth volume of the International Library of Social Science, price a dollar a volume, and we expect to have copies ready for delivery before the end of June.

THE WORKS OF JOSEPH DIETZGEN.

The long-promised volume entitled "Some of the Philosophical Essays of Joseph Dietzgen" is now ready, and we do not hesitate in calling it the most important addition to the socialist literature available for English readers that has appeared for years. It contains a sketch of Dietzgen's life, an introductory essay by Eugene Dietzgen contrasting the proletarian method of research developed by Joseph Dietzgen with the bourgeois method shown at its best in such writers as Max Stirner, and a translation of a considerable number of Dietzgen's shorter works. It makes a handsome volume of 362 pages, such as would be published by any capitalist house at not less than \$2.00. Through the generosity of Eugene Dietzgen, who contributes the translation and the electrotype plates to the work of our co-operative publishing house, we are enabled to offer this book at \$1.00 postpaid, with the usual discount to our stockholders. Our printers are now at work on a second volume of Dietzgen's works, which will be issued in the same style and at the same price in the course of a few weeks. It will be entitled, "The Positive Outcome of Philosophy," and besides the work from which the volume is named, will contain "Letters on Logic" and "The Nature of Human Brain Work."

THE LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS.

The delays in publishing the sixth and seventh volumes of this library have been many and vexatious, but we are glad to announce that the plates of both, "Life and Death" and "The Making of the World," are now completed, and that we expect to fill all orders for these books before the end of June.

THE SOCIALISTS: WHO THEY ARE AND WHAT THEY STAND FOR.

This new propaganda book by John Spargo is rapidly taking its rightful place in the literature of the socialist movement as *the* best book to put into the hands of a new inquirer. The great thing about a really good literary style like Spargo's is that it suits every one. The uneducated man likes it because it is easy; the educated man likes it because it is artistic. Then in its substance also Spargo's book suits everyone. He states the fundamentals of Marxian socialism with a scientific accuracy that defies the criticism of an "impossibilist," and yet he states these principles with what Matthew Arnold, the great English critic, used to call "sweet reasonableness," so that he does not antagonize but persuade readers to whom the ideas are new. He has done all this in few words, so that in making a book of the usual size of the Standard Socialist Series, we have been enabled to use large type and wide margins, making the book very attractive to the casual reader.

Try the book on some one who is not yet a socialist, and watch the result. Now ready, cloth, 50 cents postpaid.

THE FINANCES OF THE PUBLISHING HOUSE.

The book sales for May were \$1,056.97. The receipts from the sale of stock were \$229.30. The donations were \$15.00 from Mrs. S. D. Whitney of California and \$1.00 from L. E. Seney of British Columbia, besides which Eugene Dietzgen contributed \$300.00 toward the cost of plates of "The Positive Outcome of Philosophy," as already explained. The receipts of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for the month were \$175.80. This is an improvement over last month, but the necessary outlay on the REVIEW each month is not less than \$250.00.

Several hundred subscriptions to the REVIEW expire with this June number. To continue the magazine we must not simply find a new subscriber in place of each one who does not renew; we must also enlarge the list. If this can not be done it will indicate that the REVIEW is not desired by the American socialist movement. If you think it is desired, back up your opinion by sending in several new subscriptions.



32101 076886231



